

THE RUSSIAN REVIEW



*An American Quarterly
Devoted to Russia
Past and Present*

OCTOBER
1959

Vol. 18, No. 4

Price \$1.25

Contributors To This Issue

ROBERT C. TUCKER served in the U. S. Embassy, Moscow, for eight years between 1944 and 1953, returning to Russia in 1958 as a member of the party of Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson; author of articles on Soviet policies and ideology in professional journals and of a forthcoming book *The Alienated World of Karl Marx*. He is at present Associate Professor of Government at Indiana University.

W. CHAPIN HUNTINGTON (1884-1958), State Department official and an authority on the Soviet Union, is the author of *The Homesick Million: Russia-Out-of-Russia*, 1933; in 1944 he was Editor-In-Chief of The Russian Translation Project of the American Council of Learned Societies.

ROBIN KEMBALL has recently received the Ph. D. degree in Russian literature at the University of Basle, Switzerland. His doctoral thesis was *Alexander Blok - A Study in Rhythm and Metre*.

HEINZ SCHURER, born in Leipzig, received his Ph. D. degree from Leipzig University in 1933, specializing in the German Labor movement of the Weimar Republic. Since 1956 he has been Librarian at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies at London University and has contributed articles to professional journals in England, Germany, and the United States.

VICTOR P. PETROV was educated at the Institute of Jurisprudence in Harbin, Manchuria, and subsequently received the Ph. D. Degree in International Relations in the United States. He is teaching in the U. S. Naval Postgraduate System and has contributed extensively to German, British, and American scholarly journals.

THE RUSSIAN REVIEW

*An American Quarterly Devoted to Russia
Past and Present*

Vol. 18

October, 1959

No. 4

☆ ☆ ☆

Party and Church in the Soviet Union, Travel Notes, <i>Robert C. Tucker</i>	285
Michael Lomonosov and Benjamin Franklin: Two Self-Made Men of the Eighteenth Century, W. <i>Chapin Huntington</i>	294
Poems from Blok and Akhmatova. (Translations), <i>Robin Kemball</i>	307
Alexander Helphand-Parvus — Russian Revolutionary and German Patriot, <i>Heinz Schurer</i>	313
Some Observations on the 1959 Soviet Census, <i>Victor P. Petrov</i>	332

BOOK REVIEWS

The Agrarian Foes of Bolshevism, <i>by</i> Oliver H. Radkey, <i>Richard Pipes</i>	339
The Origins of Russia, <i>by</i> George Vernadsky, <i>Serge A. Zenkovsky</i>	340
Germany and the Revolution in Russia, 1915-1918. Docu- ments from the Archives of the German Foreign Min- istry, <i>by</i> Z. A. B. Zeman (ed.), <i>Fritz T. Epstein</i>	342
Russia and the Soviet Union, <i>by</i> Warren B. Walsh, <i>F. Ka- zemzadeh</i>	344

Continued on Page II

Russian Far-Eastern Policy, 1881-1904, <i>by</i> Andrew Malozemoff, <i>George C. Guins</i>	346
The Soviet Navy, <i>by</i> Commander M. G. Saunders, RN (ed.), <i>A. E. Sokol</i>	346
Seven Roads to Moscow, <i>by</i> Col. W. G. F. Jackson, <i>Marc Raeff</i>	348
Soviet Policy and the Chinese Communists, 1931-1946, <i>by</i> Charles B. McLane, <i>Richard L. Walker</i>	349
Dostoevsky or Tolstoy. An Essay in the Old Criticism <i>by</i> George Steiner, <i>Ralph E. Matlaw</i>	351
The Evolution of a Conservative, <i>by</i> William Henry Chamberlin, <i>Bruce C. Hopper</i>	352
<hr/>	
Index to Volume 18	355
Errata	360

THE RUSSIAN REVIEW

Dimitri von Mohrenschildt

Editor

William Henry Chamberlin
Ralph T. Fisher, Jr.
Michael Karpovich

Warren B. Walsh
Alexis Wiren
Serge A. Zenkovsky

The purpose of *The Russian Review* is to interpret the real aims and aspirations of the Russian people, as distinguished from and opposed to Soviet Communism; and to advance general knowledge of Russian culture, history and civilization. The Review invites contributions by authors of divergent views, but the opinions expressed in any individual article of this journal are not necessarily those of the editors.

Copyright 1959 by the Russian Review, Inc., 235 Baker Library, Hanover N. H. Published quarterly in January, April, July and October. Entered as second class matter at the post office in Hanover, N. H., under the Act of March 3, 1897. Additional entry at the post office in Deep River, Conn. Subscription rates: \$5.00 a year in the United States; Canada \$5.50; foreign \$6.00; single issues through Vol. 12, \$1.00; subsequent single issues \$1.25. Cumulative Index to Vols. I-X (Nov. 1941, Oct. 1951), \$.75 per copy. The contents of this publication cannot be reprinted without permission of the editors. Unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by stamped, self-addressed envelopes.

Party and Church in the Soviet Union -- Travel Notes

By ROBERT C. TUCKER

THE object of this article, which presents some recent observations on religious policy and religious activities in Soviet Russia, is not to reconstruct the total picture of religion in Russia but at most to etch out certain significant features of it more sharply. The observations were made during a journey which the writer was privileged to take in the latter part of 1958 as a member of the party of Governor Adlai Stevenson. In addition to Leningrad and Moscow, the itinerary included visits to Central Asia, Siberia, the Urals, and the Volga region. Impressions derived from these travels may help to bring into clearer perspective some tendencies and issues of the present moment in the field of church-state relations which show up (from the official point of view) in the Soviet press and periodicals.

The principal tendency and issue as reflected in the Soviet press can be stated quite simply: renewed tension between organized religion in the Soviet Union and the supreme political authority, the Communist Party. This renewal of tension, or more accurately the renewal of active widespread atheistic propaganda by the Party, is probably not to be described as a return to the frantic anti-religious campaign of 1954. That campaign was halted by a decree signed by Khrushchev, "On Errors in the Conducting of Scientific-Atheistic Propaganda among the Population." The "errors" in question were administrative acts of repression such as the closing down of churches, repressive actions against clergymen, and so forth. Whether similar "errors" are now taking place again on any appreciable scale, we do not know. But it is clear to any reader of the Soviet press that an intense organized campaign of anti-religious prop-

aganda and agitation has been developing in the Soviet Union since the middle of 1958 and is still in progress.

A very interesting and significant, and to some extent novel, feature of the present renewed anti-religious drive is the definite note of defensiveness that is detectable in it. The Party, through its central *Agitprop* and the lesser *agitprops* down the line to the *raions*, is mobilizing an army of agitators and propagandists, to mount a sustained offensive, a campaign of verbal hostilities, against religious influences ("survivals") in the minds of Soviet citizens. But the attacker seems afraid. He seems to be actuated not by any serious hope of routing the enemy from the field but at most of repulsing his insidious advance. The goal seems to be not to defeat organized religion, but to compete with it and contain it. The official press provides numerous bits of evidence of this.

Thus, for example, we read in *Kommunist* of the need to wage a fight for the minds of a considerable segment of Soviet society that is called "the waverers" — and there arises from such language, inevitably, the image of the society as the field of a shadowy contest between two great adversaries, the Party and the Church, for spiritual influence.¹ We see official suggestions being put forward that the Komsomol create some sort of Komsomol-type religious ceremony — manifestly to combat the appeal of the religious type for young people. We learn that people are seeking and receiving moral enlightenment in problems of daily life from the pulpit; and the Party announces publication of a "Little Library of Moral Literature" to serve this need! We read querulous complaints in the Party press about various shocking new arguments of believers to the effect that there is no contradiction between Christianity and socialism since Christianity invented socialism, and that the celebrated conflict of science and religion is itself a myth.

The impression created by all this is that the churches, or

¹"Apart from atheists on the one hand and believers on the other, we have one other and rather large category of people — the waverers." ("Usilit nauchno-ateisticheskuyu propagandu," *Kommunist*, No. 17, December, 1958, p. 93). The article (an unsigned editorial) also refers to what it calls "an activization of the *religiozniki*" as taking place at the present time.

some of them at any rate, have been quietly extending their influence among more and more people, that the ruling Party finds this highly disquieting, and that its present anti-religious propaganda and agitation campaign, unlike some in the past, is designed more to check the further gradual spread of religious observance and sentiment than to eliminate these phenomena. What light if any can observations made in Russia in the latter part of 1958, on a trip through numerous areas of the country, shed upon this inference?

On the affirmative side, I might mention first that informal conversation with Soviet citizens here and there brought forth a rather different general picture of the influence of the Church in Soviet society than is frequently held abroad. In the image held abroad, the Church — organized religion — occupies at best a small and precarious niche in the Soviet scheme of things, exerting less and less influence on fewer and fewer people. But this was not the picture that emerged from conversations with Soviet citizens in various places: On the contrary, one could infer from what they said that the Church has become in some ways a rather formidable power in the life of the country. Indeed, one person went so far as to affirm that there are "two powers" (*dve vlasti*) in Soviet Russia today — the state and the church. The latter, of course, was seen as distinctly the lesser power and in a disadvantageous position in many respects, and the statement was made as a conscious exaggeration, yet as an exaggeration meant to bring out a truth. Especially the Russian Orthodox Church, it was suggested, is a force in the life of the country. A very wealthy and ramified organization and a *non-Party* organization — this was the picture conveyed of the Russian Orthodox Church in present-day Soviet Russia. And, most important, it was seen as an organization whose influence is waxing rather than waning.

While these informal Soviet views of the situation may be a needed corrective for the image often entertained by foreigners of a very weak and weakening Church, other observations suggested the need for great caution in accepting the "two-power" formula. If the Russian Orthodox Church has in fact become a second "power" in the land, even in a somewhat figurative sense

of the word, one would logically expect this position to be expressed in a growth of the number of functioning churches. In the numerous cities we visited, however, the only recently opened Orthodox Church seen was the Holy Trinity Cathedral in the Alexander Nevsky Monastery in Leningrad, which was reopened in 1957. Three or four hundred people were in attendance at a Sunday service, although a priest afterwards remarked that as many as 8,000 come on major religious holidays. This is one of eleven or twelve Russian Orthodox churches now open in Leningrad.

In the large cities visited in the interior of the country, the number of Orthodox churches in proportion to the Russian population was much less than in Leningrad with its dozen or so, and Moscow with its considerably larger number. In fact, observations in Gorky, Kazan, Sverdlovsk, Novosibirsk and Alma-Ata (whose population of over a half million was informally reported as being about 80% Russian), suggested that the Soviet authorities have established a "norm" of two or at most three functioning Russian Orthodox churches for large interior cities with a population of a half million to a million. For example, the number reported to be open in Alma-Ata was three, in Sverdlovsk, Kazan, and in Novosibirsk, two each.

On the other hand, a small episode in Sverdlovsk — formerly Ekaterinburg and the capital city of the Urals — highlighted for a fleeting moment the spectacle of a church community pressing for a larger place and scope for activity. Inside the lovely, two-hundred-year-old Ivanovskaya Church, a lay elder, in the presence of officials of the city Soviet of Sverdlovsk, said that there were now two Russian Orthodox churches open in the city, that the church community had asked permission to reopen for services a cathedral building in an old monastery in the city, now being used for other purposes, but that the city authorities had refused this permission. "We offered to pay for it, too," he added with a glance at the silent city officials. The statement is particularly noteworthy in contrast to that of a Russian Church dignitary met elsewhere in the country who, when asked why more Russian Orthodox churches have not been opened, said that as many are open and functioning as the

believers among the people have financial means to support. Obviously, this is not the case. Clearly, there is tension between some church communities and the political authorities over the policy of restricting the number of churches permitted to function. Finally, and perhaps not so obviously, it is not the policy of the higher Church authorities to bring this issue into the open in conversation with foreign visitors, but churchmen "at the front" are not always so diplomatic in their relations with the State.

One of the points of concern to the anti-religious forces of the Party, as mentioned earlier, is the fact that some people in Russia are mentally resisting the long-standing Party argument that religious belief is incompatible with science. An interesting illustration of debate on this issue, and of one way in which debate on it takes place, was provided one Saturday evening at an open-air Party lecture forum in the Gorky Park in Moscow. Having completed her lecture on the incompatibility of science and religion, the woman lecturer was answering questions passed up to her on slips of paper from the audience. The first question ran: "How do you explain the fact that Academicians Pavlov and Filatov were believers?" The aim of the question was, of course, to say, or rather to imply, that there cannot be any real and deep incompatibility between religion and science if such eminent scientific minds as those of the physiologist Pavlov and the eye surgeon Filatov can accept religion. The Party lecturer began her answer by saying: "I get this question every time." Then she proceeded to argue that tradition is tenacious, and that some few members of an older generation of scientists remain influenced by "survivals" of older ways of thinking outside their fields of special competence.

Surely this exchange is a significant sign of the times. What it illustrates is a growth of resistance on a purely intellectual plane to the Party's essentially *nineteenth-century* conception of religion and its relation to science. In that conception religious systems of thought are seen as *competitors* of scientific truth, *i.e.* as poor physics. Evidently, more and more people in twentieth-century Russia are becoming too sophisticated to be influenced by such a crude misconception of what religion means.

An unpleasant and unenviable dilemma may be emerging for *Agitprop*: To persist with the old line of argumentation, with less and less effect on people's minds, or to re-examine the whole issue of science versus religion in search of a more sophisticated polemical position. For various reasons the second alternative is difficult or impossible to adopt, and the Party today is simply redoubling efforts to persuade people that it is right on an issue that more and more of them, it would seem, are coming to regard as unreal.

In Tashkent the Deputy Chief Mufti of the Moslems of Central Asia and Kazakhstan, Ismail Maksum, affirmed that religious observance has increased in recent years among the Moslem peoples of this part of the Soviet Union. However, the extent of permitted organized religious activities appeared, from his own further statements, to be severely restricted. Tashkent, the capital of the largest Central Asian republic, Uzbekistan, has sixteen "large" (*sobornye*) mosques, he said, and about one hundred "small" ones. "Small" apparently means home mosques, although this was not admitted. In Uzbekistan as a whole there are two hundred of the "large" mosques and a thousand "small" ones (the population of the republic being around eight millions, the overwhelming majority of whom are Moslems). Religious education is conducted entirely in the families of the devout and through what Ismail Maksum called "groups meeting in private homes." In 1957 twenty-five or thirty Uzbeks made the pilgrimage to Mecca.

On a visit to the main Tashkent Mosque we were shown the newly opened *madrasseh* (theological seminary), which was described as a "secondary institution." It has fifty students and eight teachers, but may later be expanded and raised to the level of a higher theological institution. Its library of ten thousand volumes contained copies of the new edition of the Koran in Arabic script which was put out in Tashkent in 1957 in the pitifully small number of 3,000 copies. This edition, it was said, "sold out very quickly." A new edition of 6,000 was planned for the near future.

A visit to the Russian Baptist Church in Moscow during a Sunday morning service fortified the impression carried away

by numerous foreign travelers that the Protestant movement in Russia, though relatively small in numbers, is second to none in spirit and vitality. About two thousand worshippers, mostly but not exclusively older people, and in the great majority women, were packed into the rather small church building, which serves on alternate days as the church of the Seventh-Day Adventists. Baptist churchmen with whom we spoke after the service stated that this Baptist Church has 4,400 members, that there are 530,000 Baptists in the whole Soviet Union, that there are in the country nearly 5,000 Baptist churches. The overwhelming majority of these would evidently fall in the category of "prayer-houses" comparable to the "small" mosques in Central Asia.

The only high clergyman encountered on these travels who gave a picture of a religion in decline was the new Chief Rabbi of Moscow, Rabbi Levin, although he did say that attendance at services in the Moscow main Synagogue, where he officiates, has increased in the recent past. He referred, however, to a decline of religious interest and observance among the youth of Jewish faith in the Soviet Union. This trend was treated as natural and inevitable and in no way a product of government policy. The city and province of Moscow, with a total Jewish population estimated at 400,000, have, he said, four "official" synagogues and about a hundred "home" ones, meaning regularly conducted services in private apartments for groups of not less than ten worshippers. A Jewish theological seminary was opened in 1957 at the central Moscow Synagogue to train future Rabbis. It now has twenty students in training. A Jewish prayer book was published recently, but the Rabbi could not recall the size of the edition.

It hardly needs to be emphasized in the light of all this that the "freedom of religious worship" proclaimed by Article 124 of the Soviet Constitution is honored rather in the breach than in the observance. Behind these various statistics pertaining to the different religions in the Soviet Union one feels the shadowy presence of the governmental authorities pursuing a policy of restricting the number of churches permitted to function, rationing the number of students in theological seminaries, reduc-

ing editions of vital religious texts to token numbers — in short, using the powers of the Soviet state to restrict the facilities open to organized religion. One feels in the guarded manner of the churchmen as they speak about the position of their denominations an awareness that one of the rules in this unequal game prohibits disclosure of all this “background” to the foreigner. And finally, one feels, particularly so far as the Russian Orthodox Church and Protestant movement are concerned, that there is a countervailing power which sustains the weaker party — the power of persistent, if not increasing popular attachment, to religion.

Apart from the apparently decreasing effectiveness of the established lines of anti-religious argumentation, about which I have spoken earlier, there would appear to be several possible explanations for this most interesting phenomenon. One, no doubt, is that the search for meaning which has found many forms of expression in the West in the middle of the twentieth century is going on in many Russian minds too, and there as well as in the West one of the places to which people turn to find meaning in existence is the Church. Another is the universal need for ritual and ceremony to mark the momentous occasions of human experience such as birth, marriage, and death, a need which no Komsomol weddings or Party-conducted funeral services can deeply satisfy for more than the merest few. A further explanation, somewhat subtle perhaps but I suspect important, is that churches alone of all the organized social institutions in Soviet Russia offer in some sense a haven from “the system”; only in the most marginal sense do they belong to the ubiquitous mechanism of the Soviet political system. They alone are in it but not of it, offering some escape from politics.

One further factor remains to be mentioned. Today the motives which prompt people in Russia to go on occasion to church are operating in a changed political scene and atmosphere. The Soviet control system remains intact, but the citizen is not, at present, living in a national atmosphere permanently tinged with terror as in Stalin's later years. Party rule in all departments of the nation's life may be onerous to him, but it does not

strike fear into his heart as did secret-police rule under the previous administration. Accordingly, it may very well be that the signs of rising influence of religion reflect, in part, a feeling of greater latitude to go to church as distinguished from merely wishing to go to church. Khrushchev's attempt to operate the Soviet system if possible without the systematic use of police terror is evidently generating, as it was bound to generate, a number of more or less serious problems for the regime. Not the least of these may prove to be the problem of religious revival.

Michael Lomonosov and Benjamin Franklin: Two Self-Made Men of the Eighteenth Century

By W. CHAPIN HUNTINGTON

IF the following hypothetical question were asked: "What universal genius of the eighteenth century was a self-made man who —

was born in poverty and obscurity?

ran away in his teens to escape a cramped environment?

told a lie in order to accomplish his escape to opportunity?

married an uneducated woman who could not share his thoughts and interests?

all his life was devoted to scientific observation and experiment?

discovered the identity of electricity and lightning?

was deeply interested in public education, founded a university?"

The most probable answer to this question would be, of course, the American genius, Benjamin Franklin. Another might be the Russian genius, Michael Lomonosov. And both answers would be right.

Why is Lomonosov so little known, while Franklin is a household word? Why is a man who is in so many ways almost a counterpart of Franklin virtually unknown to the average reader, and indeed is unmentioned in some authoritative histories of science, while Franklin is known and honored throughout the western world?

Both were self-made men — but what is a self-made man? Webster says: "One risen from obscurity or poverty by his own

exertions." But recently, in a book called *Immigrant's Return* by Angelo M. Pellegrini, I came across a definition which probes more deeply: "The self-made man, a typically American phrase, describes a reality as fanciful as pink elephants. What it actually describes is a man who has been willing to work; who has received the necessary cooperation of his fellow men; and who has operated in a society which not only applauded man's effort to rise above the level on which he was born, but also asserted as a matter of principle every man's right to self-realization. Such a man is no more self-made than he is self-created: for where such conditions are wanting, individual effort leads nowhere."

In these theses, perhaps, lies the clue to the difference in achievement or, more accurately, recognized achievement, of a great Russian and a great American.

Michael Vasilyevich Lomonosov was born in 1711, five years after Benjamin Franklin, in a little village north of Archangel. His father, a descendant of bold, unruly pioneers, was a "State" peasant; that is, he was a serf belonging to the State and not to a private land-owner. Thus he enjoyed comparative freedom, which allowed him to ply his trade of deep-sea fisherman. Very early Michael showed a passion for learning and especially for natural science. Through the help of a literate neighbor, supplemented later by lessons from the deacon of the village church, he learned to read and write both Church Slavonic, the language of the liturgy, and vernacular Russian.

Books in that barren environment were few and far between, so that for a long time the boy's only reading was religious books, the Psalter and the Lives of the Saints. Eventually, however, he came upon his first secular works, an arithmetic and a Slavonic Grammar, which he devoured. Compared to this meager diet, Franklin's boyhood reading list seems almost extensive!

His not unkind but illiterate father, who desired only that his son should succeed him in his business, had little sympathy for his son's studiousness, and his "wicked and jealous" stepmother — (his own words in later life) — repeatedly drove the boy out of the house to study in the cold where he might.

Fortunately, Michael was well-liked in the community and had literate friends who sympathized with his ambition for a scientific education. These friends told him that, in order to study science, he had to know Latin, and that he must therefore attend a high school. Such a school was the famous Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy of the Spassky Monastery of the Saviour in Moscow, over 800 miles to the south.

Unknown to his parents, his departure was quietly arranged. A friend paid his poll tax, which allowed him to be absent from the peasant commune for a year. Others obtained his passport, and he slipped out in a winter sledge caravan on December 7, 1730. He was nineteen years old. At that age, Benjamin Franklin, expert journeyman printer, was at work in London.

Lomonosov arrived in Moscow about the middle of January, 1731 and lodged with a fellow villager who was a clerk in one of the agencies of Archangel fish merchants. As soon as possible he submitted to the Abbot of the Monastery of the Saviour a petition for admission to the Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy. The Abbot saw before him a tall, strongly built, well-favored youth with a resonant voice, consciously correct speech with a slight ecclesiastical flavor and, doubtless, a winning way with the clergy.

In his petition, Lomonosov told a lie of necessity. He declared himself the son of a nobleman of Kholmogory, an important town across the River Dvina from his village and the seat of an archbishopric. If he had not done this, he would have been refused admission forthwith, and the cultural history of Russia would have been different, because, by a decree of the Holy Synod, the Academy was ordered "not to admit people belonging to estate-owners and the sons of peasants." Luckily, no proof of his declaration was demanded. Some years later the facts came out and expulsion threatened, but by that time Lomonosov had made such a record as a student that he was allowed to remain and finish the course.

The academy Michael Lomonosov entered was a scholastic institution with veneration for the past. The program of studies covered eight years and was severe, indeed. The young peasant from the North completed it in five years. The first years em-

phasized grammar and syntax with instruction in Latin, Greek, and Church Slavonic; minor subjects were geography, history, arithmetic, and the Catechism. The next years stressed poetry and rhetoric, in which students were obliged to use Latin in their studies of prosody, composition, and eloquence. In the final years, the major subjects were philosophy and religion, and the students graduated with the degree of "Learned Theologian."

The academic load was the easiest part of Lomonosov's life at the Spassky Academy. All his hardy Northern constitution was required to endure the poverty and privation enforced by a stipend of only six kopecks a day (a few cents in our money). And, although he was getting a sound general education, he had no opportunity at Spassky to study the subject he loved best, natural science.

Suddenly a way was opened. Baron Korff, President of the newly-organized Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg, was seeking to recruit promising students for the university which was a department of the Academy, and he called upon the Abbot of the Monastery of the Saviour to send him twenty of his best students for advanced study. Twelve were recommended, the best of whom was Lomonosov. After a year at the university a more dazzling opportunity presented itself. The Academy of Sciences needed a qualified metallurgist for a Siberian expedition and no foreign expert appeared to want the post. Therefore, it was decided to send three well-prepared Russians to Germany for special training in mining and metallurgy.

Again Lomonosov's abilities were so well recognized that he was selected as one of the trio. The future metallurgists would go first to the University of Marburg for a general scientific grounding under the guidance of Professor Christian Wolf, who had advised Peter the Great in the organization of the Academy of Sciences and helped choose its first personnel. After completing their course at Marburg the Russian students would go on to the School of Mines in Freiburg for special study.

The three young men were duly briefed and instructed on their choice of courses, their personal behavior, and the hand-

ling of their money. Their stipend was a generous one, 1200 rubles a year, forty times Lomonosov's Spassky stipend, and they were on no account to incur debts.

On November 3, 1736, their stagecoach rolled into the picturesque town of Marburg, where they were met by Professor Wolf. Lomonosov was then twenty-five years old. At the same age Franklin had returned to Philadelphia from London and established his printer's shop, was publishing a newspaper, and had married Deborah Read.

In Marburg Lomonosov pursued his studies with enthusiasm and made a most favorable impression on the faculty. In this, the Age of Enlightenment, when science and the humanities had not yet been divorced, a wide range of interests was possible, and in Marburg Lomonosov became acquainted with the best in contemporary European thought. From his association with German students, he also learned much, and the beautiful student songs, which he came to know by heart, were not without influence upon his studies of versification.

Unfortunately, Lomonosov's head was turned by the "academic freedom" of the German university student. A powerful, good looking young man, with a crude peasant background, closely supervised all his life, and just graduated from the poverty and austerity of a monastic school, he found himself suddenly in a delightful, strange country with a pocket full of money. Unrestrained by the German student's innate sense of order and of the bounds of merrymaking, he and his two companions abandoned themselves in their leisure hours to drinking, brawls, and riotous living marked by an overwhelming fondness for the fair sex. When at last their course was finished and they were leaving for specialized study in Freiburg, a swarm of creditors descended with claims amounting to 12,000 rubles! Professor Wolf tolerantly settled the debts out of his own pocket and was later reimbursed by the Academy of Sciences. Lomonosov wept openly in shame.

Lomonosov learned metallurgy at the School of Mines at Freiburg, but after a year he decided that he had had enough, and he was finally authorized by the Academy to return to St. Petersburg. He arrived there in July, 1741, and began his career

in the Academy of Sciences where he was to spend the rest of his life. He was now thirty years old and the best educated scientist in Russia.

One thing he did not report to the Academy: he had secretly married, the year before, Elizabeth Zilch, the daughter of his landlord, a tailor and church elder of Marburg. He had left her behind him with a baby daughter, promising to send for her as soon as he was established in his new position.

The Imperial Academy of Sciences had been founded by Peter the Great, who was inspired by the example of the Royal Society for Improving Natural Knowledge in London, and of other similar academies of Europe. Peter intended it as the apex of an educational system which should lift Russia out of her backwardness into modern life. It was a misfortune that he did not live to see his Academy in operation, because it sorely needed his strong guiding hand. Instead, the opening assembly was attended by his widow and successor, Catherine I, the one-time servant girl, who was illiterate although by nature intelligent and energetic. During the thirty-seven years which intervened between Peter's death and the accession of Catherine the Great, the Academy functioned under six sovereigns: three pleasure-loving women, a boy of 12, a baby, and an idiot.

In such an atmosphere of whims, Court favorites, intrigues, disorderly finances, and insecurity, Lomonosov was relatively fortunate that most of his career lay in the reign of Elizabeth, daughter of Peter the Great, who was well disposed toward the Academy, and that he enjoyed the powerful patronage of her favorite, Count Ivan Shuvalov, an able, humane, and enlightened nobleman.

Lomonosov was assigned a small apartment in the Academy building and after some months was appointed Adjunct in the Department of Physics. In the stress of his new duties and associations, he seems temporarily to have forgotten his wife in Marburg. She, however, grew impatient at his silence and sent him a letter through the nearest Russian Ambassador. He replied, sending her money for traveling expenses, and she presently arrived in St. Petersburg with her small daughter, after a separation of three years. The Secretariat allotted the new fam-

ily a larger apartment, and soon after, Lomonosov was appointed Professor of Chemistry and became a ranking member of the Academy. His life was now more settled and regular, although life could never be smooth for this restless and stormy temperament.

During his twenty-four years in the Academy, the amount of original scientific work produced by Lomonosov was enormous. His scientific career falls naturally into three periods: the first devoted to physics, the second to chemistry, and the third to several applied sciences: geology, geography, meteorology, astronomy, and navigation. His brilliant, comprehensive, and far-reaching mind, well-schooled in mathematics and inductive reasoning, led him to prophetic insights, bold generalizations, and lucid formulations which were often a century and more ahead of his time.

Thus his Corpuscular Theory foreshadowed the Atomic Theory of Dalton; he first formally declared the Conservation of Matter to be a basic law of chemistry; and his explanation of combustion anticipated Lavoisier. Certainly, on the evidence, it seems not too much to call him the "Father of Physical Chemistry," the modern alliance of physics, chemistry, and mathematics. In the same year as Franklin, but independently, Lomonosov, working with his friend Richmann, proved the identity of electricity and lightning. Both had set up "thunder machines" in their homes, connected with lightning rods on the roof, and Richmann was subsequently killed while experimenting with his.

Of course, many of Lomonosov's concepts had to remain prophecies, because instruments, methods, and techniques were lacking to realize them. However, his was the first chemical laboratory in Russia, and perhaps the first teaching laboratory in Europe.

Virtually none of this tremendous output of one man's mind was ever published. Substantially all of his scientific work in the form of speeches, dissertations, memoirs, and book manuscripts, carefully dated — most of it in excellent Latin — lay dormant in the archives, unknown to foreign scholars, and even to most Russians, until it was unearthed at the beginning of

the twentieth century by Lomonosov's biographers. Professor Boris N. Menshutkin (1874-1938), made a lifework of classifying, editing, and translating this storehouse of material and published it in 1912. Menshutkin's biography of Lomonosov was translated under the auspices of the American Council of Learned Societies and published in 1952 by the Princeton University Press.

Even this brief sketch will serve to point out the difference in the character of the scientific work of Lomonosov and Franklin. Lomonosov was a professional scientist, who had received the best university education his age afforded, including thorough training in higher mathematics. Franklin was largely self-taught; with him science was an avocation. His experiments with electricity led him to invent the lightning rod, a useful safety device which gained wide publicity through *Poor Richard's Almanac* and the *Gentleman's Magazine* of London. Lomonosov's experiments in the same field were duly reported to a restricted group of learned colleagues in the Academy of Sciences, and seem to have got no farther, whether from lack of funds for publication in the Academy treasury, or because of apathy or opposition, is not now known. In any case there was then in Russia no numerous public capable of appreciating such scientific work. Franklin, a skilled propagandist in the best sense, with experience in journalism and business affairs, a man of many friendships and conducting a wide correspondence in the Western world, was in an infinitely more fortunate position to make his results known.

"Poetry is my solace — physics, my profession," wrote Lomonosov to his patron, Count Shuvalov. But to the public it seemed just the reverse. Russia was unprepared to appreciate or utilize Lomonosov's scientific achievements, but, ironically, there was a "market" for his literary talents. Thus, even 140 years after his death, a standard Russian encyclopedia could state that Lomonosov was a "popularizer of the natural sciences" but that his "chief work was in the elaboration of the Russian literary language."

As a member of the Academy of Sciences, in a society dominated by the court of a despotic monarch, it was part of Lomo-

nosov's official duties to write odes for solemn and festive occasions: the glorification of personages, accessions to the throne, imperial birthdays, victories, and the like. This made him a sort of poet-laureate, who also planned and wrote the scripts for fireworks and illuminations, which were a favorite diversion of the notables of the period. So successful were his odes that he was called the "Russian Pindar," and he was constantly torn away from his scientific researches by royal commands. It is interesting to note that such odes were the best paid form of literary art; for his ode on the accession of the Empress Elizabeth, Lomonosov received a gift of 2,000 rubles. Ode writing also brought tangible results in pensions and honors, and there is little doubt that his elevation to the rank of State Councillor, making him automatically a hereditary nobleman, was as much due to his literary as to his scientific achievements.

In these "command performances," however, behind and through the eulogy and the flattery which were obligatory, Lomonosov was a propagandist of liberal ideas, ascribing to the monarchs addressed the thoughts and intentions he wished them to have, and masking criticisms and suggestions in lofty verses. In this he became bolder as the years passed and his position became stronger.

He was at his best, however, in his spiritual odes, writing as a reverent Deist, awed by the grandeur of natural phenomena, as in his "Morning" and "Evening Meditations on the Divine Majesty," the first describing the glory of the sun, the second, wonder of the Aurora Borealis. His Deism seems warmer than Franklin's, perhaps owing to his youthful background in the Orthodox Church.

All of Lomonosov's poems were in the accentual meter, based on the succession of accented and unaccented syllables, and the number of accented feet in a line, which is as natural to Russian as it is to English. Before him Russian poetry had been forced into the syllabic meter as in Greek and Latin poetry. Lomonosov was not the first to see the need of this great change, but it was he who brought it about by the authority of his genius and by the example of his many odes. Since his time almost all the Russian poets have written in the accentual meter.

But this was only one of Lomonosov's services which have justified his titles of "transformer of our language" and "father of modern literary Russian." The literary language he inherited was a mixture of Church Slavonic, the ancient language of the Orthodox liturgy, and the native spoken Russian. To this Slavonic mixture, a century of contact with European emigrants to Russia had added a flood of undigested words and phrases — Dutch, German, French, English, as well as Polish and Latin. The absence of rules of spelling and the arbitrariness of syntax heightened the confusion. It required a patriot-genius to see through this chaos to the treasure latent in it, and to undertake the task of reform and standardization, which would lay the foundation for the great writers of the nineteenth century, such as Pushkin, Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky. Thus in 1755 he brought out his famous Grammar. It was the first grammar of the modern Russian language. It ran through eleven editions and, for half a century after his death, it had no successor.

He was an accomplished linguist, and he knew his native tongue from the austere level of its Church Slavonic element to the picturesque, grassroots level of the spoken language of the people from whom he had sprung. He purged the language of barbarisms and developed the full gamut of its resources, making it capable of expressing the whole range of modern thought. He utilized Church Slavonic as a source of philosophical, religious and abstract words, existing and yet to be formed; he invented new scientific terms; and he drew on the spoken language which had been despised by the fashionable and educated class (who affected French) for an expressive vocabulary of every day life.

Lomonosov crowned his long teaching experience by serving as Director of the University and the High School attached to the Academy. In this post he worked incessantly to open the schools to young men of the lower classes, to improve the lot of the students, and to obtain a charter granting the schools freedom of teaching and discipline, although he did not succeed in this last during his lifetime. Finally, when his longtime enemy, Schumacher, fell ill and died, Lomonosov became head of the administration of the Academy which had been his life for so

many years. A year before his death Empress Catherine the Great visited his home and his private laboratory, but she never made him President of the Academy.

The fisherman's son from the Far North had indeed come a long way, and a prophet was honored in his own country, although not for work in his true field, physical science. It had not been easy for he had had much to overcome. He was a tall, powerful man of violent passions, proud and sensitive. The veneer of civilization lay none too thick over the primitive peasant nature beneath, and unlike Benjamin Franklin, he had never taught himself self-control. Give such a man the energy of genius, unbounded self-confidence, and the sense of mission of a crusader for science and fatherland, but deny him the saving grace of humor, collisions were bound to ensue, often accompanied by extravagant behavior. He was an ardent Russian patriot struggling for recognition as a scholar in a nest of German bureaucrats of far less ability than his own. Their smug resistance or arrogant disdain of his projects provoked him to unseemly outbursts which all but broke up sessions of the Academicians' conference. While he was still an Adjunct, a number of his colleagues complained so seriously of his behavior that he was placed under house arrest for eight months, fined half his salary, and forced to make a public apology.

As an enlightened scientist defending freedom of scientific research and expression against the obscurantism which Peter the Great had by no means eradicated in Russia, Lomonosov aroused the Holy Synod which besought the Empress to forbid his writings about the multiplicity of worlds and the Copernican system. Nothing came of this but he was so embittered against the clergy that he lampooned them in some anonymous verses entitled "A Hymn to the Beard" — a reference to Peter's ukase against the wearing of beards except by the clergy. Hence the scurrilous line in these verses: "Little kids are born with beards, and how our priests adore them!"

It is hard to believe that the man who descended to such unbecoming abuse had but two years before founded Moscow University and published his epoch-making Grammar. But such was Lomonosov's paradoxical nature. He had the defects of

his qualities as when, belligerently patriotic, he accused the German historian Schlozer of treachery when the latter asked permission to take certain ancient documents to Goettingen for study; and again when he attacked the historian Miller, because he came out with the theory of the founding of the Russian State by Swedish Vikings, which is now generally accepted. Generous to his relatives, utterly without snobbery or sycophancy, devoted to his students, he was nevertheless a tyrant at home, tweaked the pages' ears at court, and kept the people at the Academy in terror of him.

Michael Lomonosov died on April 4, 1765, at the age of 54, the same as the age attained by his idol, Peter the Great. On his deathbed, he said to his friend and fellow academician Staehlin: "Friend, I see that I must die and I look on death peacefully and indifferently. I regret only that I was unable to bring to conclusion everything I undertook for the benefit of my country, for the increase of learning, and for the glory of the Academy. Now, at the end of my life, I realize that all my good intentions will vanish with me."

He was buried in the Lazarus Churchyard of the Alexander Nevsky Monastery in St. Petersburg. A great crowd attended his funeral, for with the years, his powerful personality had broken through to wider groups of people in the capital.

Benjamin Franklin would live for twenty-five years more, active to the last as a statesman and diplomatist at home and abroad. He would die at the age of 84 in a golden sunset, having lived to see the establishment of the American Republic, to which he had contributed so much.

Immediately after Lomonosov's death, all the papers in his house were seized by Count Orlov, Court Chamberlain, on order of Catherine II. Of these, his scientific works and notes were returned, but the rest, and the greater part, were concealed by the government and to this day have never been found. This is a great pity, because the lost documents undoubtedly contain Lomonosov's mature views as a statesman working for the reconstruction of Russian government and society.

Consider the advantages Franklin enjoyed. Throughout his mature life, he had a large measure of cooperation from men

about him. Secondly, he was (until 1776!) an Englishman, a citizen of Philadelphia, the freest city in the freest colony of the freest nation in the world. England in the eighteenth century had a political system which was the envy of all Europe: serfdom had been abolished centuries before; revolution was behind her; London was the cross-roads of world trade. A powerful middle class was constantly developing and enlarging its position, fed from the yeomen below and merging with the aristocracy above. This process was intensified in America where the middle class was the ruling class. Franklin, the descendant of generations of literate yeomen, was born into this middle class, which both applauded his success and believed in the right of other men to follow his example. At the age of forty-two, he was financially independent and thus able to devote himself to public affairs and scientific research.

Lomonosov lived in an atmosphere poles apart from this. Certainly, in his early life, he received the cooperation and assistance of various men, and in his mature life he had noble "protectors," without whom he could not have accomplished what he did. But for the greater part of his twenty-four years in the Academy of Sciences, he met opposition, not to say hostility, from his colleagues. As for society in Russia, it was at that time composed of the nobility, old and new, who, after death had removed Peter the Great, cast off their obligations to the State, claimed all privileges for themselves, and further enslaved the peasants. There was no middle class. The monarchy was a despotism without stability. Russia was still isolated, ignorant, superstitious, and backward. From such a society, a peasant who had made himself a scholar and was ambitious to modernize his country, could hardly expect spontaneous applause.

Russia could not have produced a Franklin. But what an opportunity Lomonosov would have had, if he had been born in America!

Poems from Blok and Akhmatova

Translated from the Russian

By ROBIN KEMBALL

ALEXANDER BLOK (1880-1921)¹

TO THE MUSE

In your melodies' inward cantation
Lies a message of doom and decline —
Hallowed covenants' strange profanation,
Even happiness scourged and maligned.

And a power so insistent within them,
I could swear with the crowd it was real —
That you called down the angels, to win them
With your beauty's seductive appeal.

And when you look on faith with derision,
Then above you there soon starts to glow
That dim, purple-grey, nimbus-like vision
I distinguished in days long ago.

Evil, kind? — Not of this world, your number.
All enigmas, the things that men tell:
For the rest you are Muse, and pure wonder.
But for me — only torment and hell.

¹All three poems reproduced here are from Blok's third book. Their widely differing character — together with the fact that they were all written within the space of eight months—says much for Blok's versatility. For the Dostoevskian nature of *To The Muse*, which "significantly introduces the third book," cf. V. Zhirmunsky: *Poeziya Aleksandra Bloka*, 1922, Ch. II, pp. 26 ff.

Ever nearer the call . . . The scene is almost certainly Shakhmatovo, Blok's much loved country home near Moscow. Cf. *inter alia* Maria Beketova: *Aleksandr Blok*, Alkonost, 1922, 2nd ed. 1930, pp. 37/8.

Dreams — for the background to this delightful childhood poem, cf. Maria Beketova: *Al. Blok i ego mat'*, 1925, pp. 24/5.

Do I know how I kept from damnation
 In that hour when, all strength in me gone,
 I was moved to implore consolation
 Of your countenance, found in the dawn?

Yes, and why, with my heart ready hardened
 To be foes, you vouchsafed me the field,
 Meadow-garlands and heaven-lit starlands —
 All your beauty's infernal appeal?

And more traitor than polar night — drunker
 Than the fire that is golden *Ayà's*,²
 And more swift than the love of *tsigankas*³
 Were those fearful caresses of yours.

And some fateful sublime consolation
 In the flouting of sacrosanct things . . .
 And desire . . . the insane exultation —
 And the gall, as of wormwood, that clings!

Dec. 29th, 1912.

Ever nearer, the call⁴ . . . And the soul of me bows to its anguish,
 Growing younger once more.
 In a dream, then, and breathless, I press to my lips the fair
 hand which
 Once was yours.

Dreams — of love once again, of the beauties a child knows,
 Gorge, and steppe-grass' free run;
 In the steppe-grass — a thorn-covered wild-rose,
 And the mist when day's done.

Through the flowers, and the leaves, and the thorn-covered
 branches, I'm sure, then,

²*Ayà* — A Caucasian white wine. Cf. also the poem *V Restorane* (*Nikogda ne zabudu . . .*), where Blok again describes it as "golden":

*Ya poslal tebe chërnuyu rozu v bokale
 Zolotogo, kak nebo, Ai.*

³*Tsiganka* (in its Russian form, *tsyganka*) — female gipsy, gipsy-girl.

⁴*Priblizhaetsia zvuk. I nokorna shchemiashchemu zvuku, . . .*

The old house will look deep in my heart.
And the skies, in their roseate expanse, will look out as before,
then,

And your window look out.

And that voice — it is yours. To its fathomless call I'll surrender
Life and grief — though I pause
In a dream but to press to my lips, still, the slender,
The fair hand that was yours.

May 2, 1912.

DREAMS

Time to sleep — and I don't want to!
It's a shame, I say!
See — the rocking-horse; what fun to
Rock — and ride away!

Misty lamp before the ikon,
One-two, one-two, one! . . .
Now the horsemen . . . how they streak on . . .
Nyanya's tale drags on . . .⁵

Old as old . . . the tale of princes,
Gallant knights, and far,
Far across the seas — the princess,
Of the princess . . . ah! . . .

One-two, one-two! Dressed in armour,
On the horsemen ride,
Lure me, bear me off to somewhere,
Riding by their side . . .

Lure me 'cross the ocean, bear me
Far across the deep,
Through the smoke-blue mist to where the
Princess lies asleep . . .

⁵*Nyanya* — Nannie.

On her crystal couch reclining,
 Hundred nights she lies;
 And the green *lampàdka* shining⁶
 Softly in her eyes . . .

Dream-brocaded, beam-pervaded,
 She can hear them all —
 Swords that clatter, silver-bladed,
 Round the crystal wall . . .

Who is that the angry prince is
 Fighting seven nights?
 On the seventh — round the princess
 Radiant shine the lights . . .

Now the rays grow wider, mingle
 With my veil of dreams.
 Hear the dungeon keys a-jingle
 In the locks, it seems . . .

Cosy dozing . . . — Dreamy? — Dreaming,
 Soon I'm sleeping tight.
 Green *lampàdka*, misty gleaming,
 How I love your light!

October, 1912.

ANNA AKHMATOVA (born 1888)⁷

That city, loved since I remember,
 Revealed itself to me this day
 Amid the silence of December —
 My costly heirloom, cast away.

⁶*Lampàdka* — the "everlasting light" (more often red but, in Russian homes, sometimes green, blue, yellow, etc.) which burns beneath the ikon.

⁷*That city, loved . . .* Composed 1929, later published in *Iva* (1940). *When Russia . . .* Written 1917, first appeared in *Podorozhnik* (1921). Boris Eikhenbaum (*Anna Akhmatova, opyt analiza*, Peterburg, 1923, p. 82) mentions the "archaic turns of phrase, reminiscent of Tyutchev or Khomyakov."

Prayer . . . Written 1915, first published in *Belaya Staya* (1917).

All that I found, once freely given,
So easy to pass on, to share:
The soul's fierce flame, the gift of heaven
In my first song, the tones of prayer —

All fell in mirrored depths, decaying.
Transparent smoke enshrouded all . . .
And then — the old street-fiddler playing
Of things since lost beyond recall.

But like a stranger, captivated
By each new object far from home,
I watched the sleighs go, fascinated,
And heard a language all my own.

And happiness welled fierce inside me,
Blew, fresh and wild, upon my lips,
As if some long-dear friend beside me
Were walking with me up the steps.

PRAYER

Give me sickness, long years of affliction,⁸
Suffocation, white nights without end,
Take my Muse — her arcane benediction,
Take my child, and it must be — my friend.
So I pray through Thy liturgy, pleading
At the end of tormenting dark days
That the storms from which Russia lies bleeding
Turn to sunclouds in search of her praise.

⁸*Dai mne dolgie gody neduga . . .*

When Russia, racked by self-perdition,⁹
Stood waiting on the German guest,
Her Church forsook that long tradition
That was Byzantium's stern bequest,
There came a voice. Consoling, gentle:
"Come, leave this land," I heard it call,
"This barren land of yours, and sinful.
"Go hence. Leave Russia once for all.

"I'll wash the blood from off your fingers,
"I'll strip your heart of all the shame.
"I'll cover up the pain that lingers —
"Each rout, affront — with some new name."
But I, unmoved, for all my anguish —
I turned aside with cool disdain,
That no such mean, unworthy language
Besmirch me with its ugly stain.

⁹*Kogda v toske Samoubiustva . . .*

Alexander Helphand-Parvus-- Russian Revolutionary and German Patriot*

By HEINZ SCHURER

AMONG the many powerful personalities who had a hand in the victory of the Russian Revolution of 1917, there can hardly be a more extraordinary figure than Alexander Helphand, better known as Parvus. Indirect as his influence on the epoch making events of 1917 may have been, it was by no means negligible. His career was so odd, his personality so enigmatic that an attempt at disentangling the many strands of his life's activities should prove worthwhile. In a memoir written a few days after his death in 1924 by a friend of thirty years' standing, the author made a very high claim for Parvus' importance. "This man possessed the ablest brains of the Second International, the International of 1889-1914," wrote Konrad Haenisch. Significantly enough, the year 1914 was also the dividing line in Parvus' political and personal fate, a *caesura* which cuts his career into two completely different phases and makes of him a man of two lives.

Born in Berezin in South Russia in 1867, and spending his younger years in Odessa, the son of a Jewish middle-class family, Parvus' early life followed the standard pattern of so many Russian revolutionaries of the period. There was participation in illegal political circles, learning a manual skill "to get closer to the common people," and an exploratory trip to Western Europe to establish contacts with Russian émigré groups. In 1887, Parvus finally settled in Western Europe as a refugee, first to pursue his studies at Bâle University, and then to establish himself as a journalist in the service of the rising German social-

*This article is based on extensive Russian, German, and Polish source material. For reasons of space a list of the main sources consulted had to be omitted. It can be obtained from the author. [Ed.]

ist movement. It was during these years in Switzerland that Parvus first met a young student from Russian Poland, Rosa Luxemburg, born in 1871, and like himself a political refugee. For many years Parvus and Rosa Luxemburg were to be close political associates. What distinguished both from most members of the Russian and Polish émigré circles in Switzerland and Germany was their refusal to be absorbed by the politics of fellow exiles, but rather, their determination to immerse themselves in the labor movement of Western Europe. To them that meant the German social democracy which, after the revocation of Bismarck's anti-socialist laws in 1890, had begun a spectacular series of electoral victories. "The German social democracy became my home," wrote Parvus in 1918. However, it should be added that he never lost contact with the Russian revolutionary movement. The tension between these two elements, the German and the Russian, became the leitmotiv of the drama of his life. Sometimes the one, sometimes the other would prevail. It seems ironical that the man who came to regard himself as a German can now claim importance only for his indirect contribution to the revolution in Russia.

About 1891 Parvus began his journalistic career by reporting on Russian affairs for the daily press and for the *Neue Zeit*, the theoretical journal of German socialism. Soon, however, he was widening his sphere of interest by commenting on internal tactical problems of the German party, and soon made a name for himself as a stimulating intellectual force and as the originator of novel proposals. Particularly noteworthy was his indefatigable campaign urging the use of the political mass strike as a new weapon of the working class. At the time this was a new idea, and Parvus soon became a source of irritation to the party leadership. For twenty years he stood at the extreme left of the movement, endeavoring to fire the German party with something of the Russian revolutionary spirit.

In the second half of the 1890's, the party leadership found itself exposed to the formidable challenge made against its traditionally Marxist philosophy by Eduard Bernstein and his followers. With Bernstein's "revisionist" attack from the right came Parvus' great opportunity. It was he who in 1898 sounded the

alarm against the "revisionist menace" in a series of leading articles in the Dresden party paper. Parvus became known internationally as the man who started the great Bernstein discussion which was to split the party until 1914. With him, on the staff of the Dresden paper, was Julian Marchlewski, another member of Rosa Luxemburg's old Swiss circle of Polish refugees. Many years later Trotsky recalled the profound influence these articles by Parvus had on him at the time, after old copies of the paper reached him in Russia. Parvus instinctively felt that the period ahead was one of great upheaval and was convinced that the transition to socialism was not a question of a remote and nebulous future, but was on the threshold of the present. This impressed Trotsky, the much younger man, very deeply.

The year 1898 which brought Parvus considerable fame as the scourge of the revisionists, also meant a crisis in his personal circumstances. After having been banished from Prussia in 1893, he was now expelled from Saxony, together with Marchlewski. On their enforced departure from Dresden, they succeeded in having Rosa Luxemburg appointed editor instead. This was her introduction to the German socialist press and later on both she and Marchlewski were to leave their mark in the annals of German Communism. Parvus, finding most of Germany closed to him, went in for an enterprise typical of his defiant temperament. With Carl Lehmann, a socialist doctor from Munich, as his companion, and duly equipped with a false passport, he set off to study the famine regions of Russia along the Volga. They reported their findings in a substantial volume published in Germany on their return.

Settling in Munich in 1900 Parvus resumed his struggle against revisionism in a series of articles which were so outspoken that the party leadership was again taken aback. Only recently have documents come to light which illustrate very clearly to what extent Parvus and Rosa Luxemburg were regarded as hotheads and firebrands by the party hierarchy; something of an alien intrusion in the solid body of German socialism. They also reveal the tremendous animosity toward them in many party circles. Parvus found himself boycotted and whatever the attractions of the role of *enfant terrible*, he felt very acutely

the insecurity of his position dependent as it was on the shifting alliances between party leadership and the left wing intelligentsia of Marxist theoreticians. When in Dresden, he had become interested in the business of running a newspaper and had carried out a highly successful reorganization of the Dresden Socialist daily. Thus, in 1902, in desperation he decided that he must have a journal of his own and thereby become independent of the changing moods of the party. As a means of raising the necessary money he founded a publishing house of his own in Munich. At that time Russia had not joined the International Copyright Convention of Berne and Russian authors' rights were not protected abroad. By publishing their works first in Russian in Munich in small token quantities their copyrights for the German market and other countries would be established and translation royalties ensured for the authors. Marchlewski was won over to the plan and the firm was set up in Munich under his name. Their best known publication was Gorky's *The Lower Depths*, and Parvus had also a share in the production of the play by Max Reinhardt which created an international sensation. This joint venture was short-lived as the two partners were caught up in the maelstrom of the Russian revolution of 1905. Their firm had to be liquidated in 1906 leaving behind a great deal of ill-feeling between the two men and between Parvus and Gorky as well. As the financial basis for a great international socialist journal, a mouthpiece of the extreme left, the Munich publishing house was a complete failure.

Ever since his arrival in Switzerland in 1887, Parvus had kept in close touch with the nascent Russian Marxist movement. In 1896 he was a member of the Russian delegation to the London Congress of the Socialist International. A man of his reputation could be of great value to the rising Russian social democracy. It was he who persuaded Lenin to choose Munich as the place of publication of *Iskra* in 1900. He became one of its most valued contributors. When the famous break between Bolsheviks and Mensheviks occurred in 1903, Parvus sided with the Mensheviks, but, typically enough, kept his own political viewpoint above the two Russian factions. Parvus and Rosa Luxemburg both upheld the conception of the spontaneous

action of the masses as opposed to the Leninist idea of the direction of the movement by a spearhead of professional revolutionaries. It was at the time of the joint publishing venture with Marchlewski that a young Russian Marxist came to him who found it equally impossible to fit into either side of the Bolshevik-Menshevik controversy. This was Trotsky, Parvus' junior by twelve years. Parvus with his fifteen years' experience in the German movement became his teacher as well as his host. His way of looking at politics, his broad perspectives, his love of such sweeping generalizations as his new idea of the obsolescence of the nation-state influenced Trotsky for the rest of his life. In 1915, after Trotsky's way had parted from that of the transformed Parvus of the war years, the former disciple generously spoke of him as the one man "to whom he has been indebted for his ideas and intellectual development more than to anybody of the older generation of European social democrats." In 1917 when Trotsky, after the Petrograd July demonstrations, was held in prison by the Provisional Government and was questioned, he stated that the years of his close association with Parvus had been from 1904 to 1909.

By the end of 1904 Trotsky had completed the manuscript of a pamphlet on the prospects of the Russian revolution to come. No sooner had he placed it in Parvus' hands than the stirring events of January 9, 1905 took place. Profoundly moved by these developments Parvus wrote a preface to the pamphlet which in the boldness of its prognosis went far beyond anything any Russian Marxist had yet dared to predict. Parvus set the course firmly for the conquest of political power in Russia by the social democratic party alone. This forecast had the effect of a bombshell in Russian socialist circles. To us nowadays, Communism is indissolubly linked with the industrialization of under-developed countries. To Parvus' generation the transition to socialism was equally linked with the most advanced countries of Western Europe. Parvus' prediction upset all established theories. Lenin regarded his assumptions as fantastic. With his concept Parvus had put himself far to the left of the main body of Russian Marxism. The only one who accepted the idea was Trotsky. The story of the Russian revolution is the story of the

conversion of Lenin to the Parvus-Trotsky line in 1917, when it had to be forced on the Bolsheviks by Lenin against the strongest possible opposition. If any man can be called the intellectual begetter of the October Revolution as it actually happened, this man is Parvus. In 1915 Trotsky, referring to his views on the character of the coming Russian Revolution, had the fairness to say: "Even now I see less reason than ever to renounce that diagnosis and prognosis the lion's share of which was contributed by Parvus."

Trotsky left for Russia at the beginning of 1905 to resume illegal political work; Parvus went in October of the same year, and the great exodus of the exiled revolutionaries from Western Europe back to Russia and Poland began, among them Rosa Luxemburg and Marchlewski. However deep the roots they had struck in the German movement the Russian revolution of 1905 drew them like a magnet. Although Parvus and Trotsky were outsiders in the eyes of both Marxist factions, the Mensheviks were more tolerant than the Lenin group. Parvus' and Trotsky's paper *Nachalo* (The Beginning) — started at the end of 1905 in St. Petersburg, nominally as a Menshevik organ — became the influential advocate of their new theory, which ultimately became known as the theory of the permanent revolution. Liberal journals contrasted the comparatively moderate position of Lenin, who looked at the idea of permanent revolution as hopelessly utopian, to the wild ravings of Parvus and Trotsky.

The relation between the two men changed rapidly. The disciple of the Munich days revealed himself as a great revolutionary leader, while the older man was not cut out for such a role. Only after the revolutionary wave was receding was he made chairman of the second Soviet of Workers' Deputies in St. Petersburg, and proved disappointing. "Parvus' political career is finished," wrote Maxim Gorky in a private letter. The Bolshevik representative in this second Soviet was Alexinsky who was to play his part in Parvus' and Trotsky's lives again.

At the beginning of 1906 Parvus was arrested and joined Trotsky as a fellow prisoner in the Peter and Paul fortress. Rosa Luxemburg, herself just released from a Warsaw jail, succeeded in visiting him. After a term in the fortress the next stage was

Siberia. At the end of 1906 Parvus escaped. His friend, Konrad Haenisch, then editor of the Dortmund socialist daily, had the surprise of his life when Parvus suddenly appeared on his doorstep in December 1906. He had to go into hiding at once and lived illegally in Dortmund for about eight weeks. At this stage, Parvus' only possessions were the clothes he wore. The Munich publishing firm had been liquidated during his absence and he had to start all over again, and at this moment it was quite impossible to launch a new business venture. In 1907 Parvus published an account of his adventures in Russia, entitled "In the Russian Bastille." In the summer of the same year Trotsky who, too, had managed to escape from Siberia appeared in Germany. Parvus arranged for the publication of the story of his escape and of his history of the 1905 revolution. When Cherevanin's book presented the story of 1905 to German readers from the Menshevik angle it was Trotsky who was given the chance to review the book in the *Neue Zeit* in the light of the theory of the permanent revolution. The Parvus-Trotsky theory gained such distinguished German adherents as Kautsky and Mehring. At the 1907 congress of the temporarily united Russian Social Democratic Party Rosa Luxemburg also came over to the theory of the permanent revolution. In 1917 she would find no difficulties in accepting its application in practice which by then had become the policy of Bolshevism. Her "Spartacus" letters of 1918 are brilliant expositions of the Parvus-Trotsky theory.

The peak year in Parvus' life was 1905. After ten years of preaching the gospel of the political strike to the deaf ears of the German party hierarchy, this form of political action became the characteristic feature of the events in Russia. In the Bolshevik-Menshevik controversy, he had championed the concept of the spontaneous unorganized activity of the masses, and on the touchstone of the 1905 revolution the soundness of his assumptions seemed to have been proved.

After the stirring days in Russia, life in Germany seemed stale and uninspiring. Trotsky thought that the quality of Parvus' writing declined during this period. Parvus must have felt something of the sort himself; he felt restless and in need of a change of milieu. After first moving to Vienna, in 1910 he

settled in Constantinople to carry on his work as a journalist there. He sensed that the next great political crisis would come from the Balkans. At first he reported brilliantly on a Young Turk movement for the German socialist press while carrying on his hand-to-mouth existence as an impecunious journalist. Then he started contributing articles to *La Jeune Turquie*, the journal of the new government, the first of these essays opening with the defiant words, "This article is written by a revolutionary Marxist." His novel analysis of the impact of Western European economic imperialism on Turkey made a considerable impression. Gradually, a change came over Parvus' personal circumstances, he started acting as business adviser to Russian and Armenian merchants in Constantinople, became prosperous and began laying the foundations of a business career of his own. In August, 1914 his personal position changed overnight. By displaying business acumen of quite an exceptional order Parvus suddenly became a key figure in the economic mobilization of Turkey, and the very first days of the war turned him into a very rich and influential man.

Equally sudden and astonishing was his political metamorphosis. In August, 1914 a new Parvus was born. The old Russian revolutionary emerged as one of the most active protagonists of the German cause in Turkey. While the German social democracy unanimously supported the German war effort Parvus justified this policy with revolutionary arguments. He maintained that the interests of international Socialism demanded the victory of the country with the most highly developed working class movement, in other words the victory of Imperial Germany. The war had forced the Central Powers into a revolutionary role towards tsarist Russia. The alliance between Prussian bayonets and Russian proletarian fists would bring about the Russian revolution. He was unique in being the one Russian socialist to take his stand as a German patriot. All his old associates in the German party with a similar background to his, such as Rosa Luxemburg and Marchlewski, took an internationalist position, as did his old friend Trotsky and the majority of Russian Social Democrat émigrés, Bolsheviks, and Mensheviks. Parvus' ties with his old circle snapped suddenly. To all

those who supported the Russian war effort, including those Russian émigrés favoring the cause of the Allies, Parvus became the arch traitor.

One of the separatist Ukrainian organizations enjoying the sponsorship of Austria-Hungary was the League for the Liberation of the Ukraine. It stood for the defeat of Russia and the disruption of the Russian Empire. At the end of 1914, while still in Constantinople, Parvus wrote a pamphlet for the League setting forth his pro-German views. From now on he was regarded with hatred in Russian patriotic circles.

In January, 1915, Parvus quite openly appeared in neutral Bulgaria in his new role of German apologist. Party frontiers not being so strict as they were to become later, it was the left wing Social Democrats, the so-called "narrow faction" which had invited him to address them in a public meeting. He urged them to support the German cause for the sake of the ultimate victory of socialism, while Plekhanov had urged them to support the Allied cause for exactly the same reason. The Bulgarians remained unconvinced by either and continued to oppose the entry of their country into the war. His intervention in Bulgaria caused a considerable stir. He, the well-known Russian revolutionary, had placed himself among those German Social Democratic leaders who traveled all over Europe putting the German case to the Socialists of the neutral countries.

It was in Rumania, in the same month of January, 1915, that Parvus embarked on a new kind of activity. Rumania was likely to enter the war on the side of the Allies, and this was opposed on internationalist grounds by the leader of the Rumanian Socialists, Rakovsky, a personal and political friend of Trotsky. When the German Socialist deputy Südekum tried to bring Rakovsky over to a definitely pro-German attitude and offered subsidies, his overtures were rejected. Parvus made a new attempt in the same direction, but it may be safely assumed that he failed with Rakovsky in Bucharest as he had failed with Blagoev in Sofia. Yet, with his knowledge of Balkan politics, all the available evidence suggests that he succeeded as a political agent while being unsuccessful on the political plane. Owing to Parvus' intervention, German subsidies appear to have reached

the Rumanian Socialists in 1915 and 1916, in all likelihood by devious means. The fact of the personal meetings between Parvus and Rakovsky in 1915 was held against Rakovsky by Russian patriot émigrés and pro-ally Rumanian publicists who branded Rumanian socialists as a German tool. These charges turned up again at the trial of Rakovsky in Moscow in 1938. Rumania presents a clear case of the Germans giving financial aid to a revolutionary socialist movement whose aims coincided with theirs. The documentary evidence, however, only came to light in 1958. There was no proof for it at the time.

In continuing the story of Parvus' meetings with representatives of the revolutionary internationalist camp it should be mentioned that he managed to meet Lenin in Switzerland in May or June, 1915, and at the same time also spoke to some members of Trotsky's group in Zurich. These were contacts on a purely political plane, but Parvus had as little success with the Russian émigrés in Switzerland as with the Balkan socialists. Some months earlier, in February, 1915, had come the first denunciation of Parvus as a renegade from the revolutionary ranks. The author of the attack was Trotsky, his friend of many years' standing, who published his "epitaph" for Parvus in his Paris paper *Nashe Slovo*. The break was announced in a dignified manner and with obvious regret.

By this time Parvus had elaborated his master plan. Germany should use all means available to stir up revolutionary troubles in Russia, using the émigré groups and the existing underground organizations. He put forward these proposals in a memorandum submitted to the German government at the beginning of 1915. The old advocate of the political mass strike, the prominent participant of the Russian revolution of 1905, offered his twenty-five years' experience in the socialist movement to the German authorities to bring about the defeat of Russia from within. The memorandum showed an amazing knowledge of the Russian political scene and singled out the Bolsheviks as the most determined group capable of action. Parvus' plan proposed the political direction of the movement by the Germans; as a first step he suggested the calling of a united congress of all émigré groups and parties in Switzerland.

The whole idea of organizing a revolution in Russia from outside, directed and financed by Germany, seems fantastic in the extreme and so it proved to be, but such was the ability and political knowledge of Parvus that the German authorities were considerably impressed. In March, 1915, Parvus, still nominally an enemy alien, was given special facilities for foreign travel and two million marks were made available for revolutionary propaganda in Russia, a large part of which sum was entrusted to him to use at his discretion. In July another five million marks were allocated for the same purpose. No details are, however, available as to whom this latter sum was passed.

The man who acted as Parvus' protector from 1915 onward was the highly original German minister in Denmark, Brockdorff-Rantzau. After the February Revolution of 1917 the latter was to criticize the German foreign secretary, Jagow — who held office until November, 1916 — for not listening to Parvus' advice. Parvus, while being entrusted with large sums, was obviously not taken too seriously in some of the official German circles. They definitely rejected his suggestion to undermine the Russian currency.

In the spring of 1915, Parvus turned up again in Germany after more than four years' absence. The man whom his old associates remembered as a poverty-stricken Russian émigré journalist of the extreme socialist left, once hounded from one German state to the next, had indeed undergone an astonishing metamorphosis. Parvus now was a very rich man engaged in large-scale international business transactions in the Balkans and in Scandinavia. Even after Rumania had joined the Allies in 1916 he managed to secure Rumanian wheat for Germany. Yet Parvus still regarded himself as a socialist. Wherever he went in Europe it was the Socialist and trade union movements with which he established contacts. His most considerable political achievement was to be his outstanding work for the German cause in Denmark where, in 1916, he established excellent relations with the Danish trade unions. These were based on his successful commercial operations with the fuel supply organization set up by these unions for the benefit of their members. This serious contribution to the German war effort

impressed Brockdorff-Rantzau and inspired him with confidence in Parvus' ambitious plans for Russia. From the middle of 1915 to the middle of 1917 Copenhagen became Parvus' headquarters. Here, in 1915, he founded his Institute for the Study of the Social Consequences of the War. He invited Russian émigrés committed to the revolutionary internationalist cause to join its staff. In his Paris paper, Trotsky warned his comrades against having anything to do with this Institute as it was bound to be a German propaganda agency. In his purely commercial undertakings, however, there were many Russian refugees working for Parvus who belonged to all shades of political opinion. A prominent Bolshevik, Hanecki, worked as a business executive for a firm in Copenhagen which was controlled by Parvus.

At last, with plentiful funds, he was in a position to found a Journal of his own and to realize his old dream. Parvus, now made a Prussian citizen for his war services, again established a publishing house in Munich. With Herzen's *Kolokol* in mind he somewhat ambitiously christened his new journal *Die Glocke*. His old friend Haenisch became its editor. Publication started in August, 1915, and the core of the contributors consisted of old members of the pre-war left wing of the Social Democratic party who now supported Germany's war effort with arguments couched in strictly Marxist terminology. During the course of the war Parvus became the trusted adviser of the two acknowledged chiefs of the Party, Ebert and Scheidemann.

With the *Glocke* as clear evidence of Parvus' new-found political convictions, Lenin went out of his way to chastise Parvus as a renegade from the cause of revolutionary internationalism. He called Parvus the German Plekhanov who, like the latter, had become a patriotic supporter of an imperialist power. This attack was published in November, 1915, in Lenin's journal *The Social Democrat* appearing in Geneva. In the early months of 1915 the former Bolshevik deputy in the Second Duma, Alexinsky had begun waging a bitter campaign against Parvus. Alexinsky had been associated with Parvus in the Petersburg Soviet of 1905, had been living in Paris as an émigré for some years, and at the outbreak of the war had turned ardent Russian patriot. He saw German agents and German spies everywhere.

Trotsky, Lenin, and Blagoev had attacked Parvus on purely political grounds; Alexinsky went much further and called him an *agent provocateur*. Alexinsky also denounced Trotsky as pro-German. Trotsky had to make it quite clear that he condemned Parvus as a German patriot, but did not regard him as an *agent provocateur*. In spite of the fact that Trotsky had publicly broken with Parvus as early as February, 1915, Alexinsky charged him with being Parvus' close associate on the strength of their pre-war alliance. In defending themselves against Alexinsky, Parvus, Trotsky, and the Bolsheviks were forced into some sort of common front. While chastising Parvus on political grounds Trotsky and the Bolsheviks never treated Parvus as a secret agent of the German government. This distinction must be borne clearly in mind.

In the light of the recently published German documents what were the results of Parvus' work in stirring up political strife in Russia? As far as the records go, we only know that large payments were made to him for this purpose in March, July, and December, 1915. There is an unmistakable element of "Our man in Havana" about all these machinations. In December, 1915, Parvus modestly estimated that about twenty million rubles would be required to get the Russian revolution completely organized. He added thoughtfully that this total could not be distributed at once else there would be a risk of its source being discovered. Still, for the moment he would be content with a mere one million rubles, to be handed over at once to his confidential agent as he wanted the Revolution to start on the ninth of January, 1916, the anniversary of the Black Sunday of 1905. Before dismissing all this as comic opera it is well to bear in mind that since 1905 the ninth of January had been traditionally remembered by the Russian working class by demonstrations and strikes. Parvus' confidential agent was stated by him to have got through to Petrograd, and there seems no doubt that the million rubles vanished into Russian pockets all right, but Parvus could only produce some embarrassed excuses for the total absence of any results. The great Russian Revolution of January, 1916, organized by Parvus, had not come off. Not surprisingly, after December, 1915, there is

nothing more in the documents showing that Parvus ever received any further subsidies for secret work in Russia. No one nowadays seriously suggests that the February Revolution of 1917 was organized with German gold.

However, the new situation created by the Revolution, gave Parvus his chance. In April, 1917, he made his one great practical contribution to the Bolshevik victory of October. The most recent German student on the subject, W. Hahlweg, is convinced that all the available evidence suggests that it was Parvus who conceived the idea of Lenin's journey from Switzerland through Germany to Russia. Ably supported by Brockdorff-Rantzau he had the lion's share of the work for this sensational return. By this move Parvus made a genuine contribution to world history as Lenin's arrival in Petrograd in April, 1917, brought about the decisive turn of events. It was then that Lenin presented the Parvus-Trotsky line of 1905 as his own prognosis to his astonished followers. The events of April, 1917, unite the two achievements which give Parvus whatever historical significance he has — the conception of the theory of the permanent revolution and his initiating Lenin's journey with its fateful consequences.

It was in connection with this journey that in April, 1917, Brockdorff-Rantzau recommended Parvus to Zimmerman, the German Foreign Secretary since November, 1916. He expressed regret that not enough attention had been paid to Parvus with regard to Russia. In the strongest terms he urged the use of Parvus' talents in the new situation and singled him out as the one man capable of establishing good relations with the Russian Left. Gone were the days when Parvus was looked upon as an agent employed for the purpose of supplying German money to Russian political groups. Parvus' successful work in Denmark in 1916 marked him out for important political missions, to act as a kind of ambassador to the socialist parties of Russia. "The connections which Helphand has in Russia could now . . . be decisive to the whole situation," wrote Brockdorff-Rantzau on April 2, 1917. The obvious way for Parvus to meet the Russian socialists was the great projected Stockholm Conference where the socialists of the Central Powers, of the Allies, and of the

neutrals were expected to gather in a preparatory peace conference.

Brockdorff-Rantzau's recommendation succeeded: in May, 1917, Parvus went to Stockholm "with the object of working for our interests at the impending Socialist Congress," as the Foreign Secretary put it in his note of introduction to the German Minister in Sweden. Since the February Revolution, a change had taken place within the ranks of Russian socialism, with many of those opposed to the Russian war effort under the Tsar now favoring the cause of the Allies since the Russian Republic had been established. The Bolsheviks had become the leading anti-war party. Parvus' aim was now a great alliance between Lenin's party and his own, the German patriotic Social Democrats. But it takes two to make an alliance — the Bolsheviks absolutely refused to have any political dealings with Parvus. When Parvus, authorized by his party to speak to the returning Bolsheviks in Sweden in April, 1917, hurried to Stockholm, Lenin refused to meet him and asked his comrades to put this refusal on record. Lenin's attitude was quite incomprehensible to the man who had done more than anybody to uncork the genie of revolution. In May, 1917, however, Parvus had good grounds for hoping that a Bolshevik delegation would arrive in Stockholm. In the Petrograd Soviet Kamenev had spoken in favor of participation. With the arrival of Lenin in Russia, however, the Bolsheviks made a *volte face* concerning the Stockholm issue and decided to boycott the Conference. Parvus had to be content with talks with the Menshevik and Social Revolutionary delegation from Petrograd, but there was no chance of preparing a separate peace by negotiations with these pro-Ally socialists.

In July, 1917, the storm suddenly burst and Parvus' name swept into the headlines of all Russian papers. He figured prominently in the charges wildly flung about in the great campaign accusing the Bolsheviks of being German agents. The attack was led by Parvus' old enemies Alexinsky and Burtsev, now returned to Russia from Paris. Lenin was accused of having accepted funds from Parvus, of being in touch with him through a chain of intermediaries. Two pieces of evidence were quoted,

the first being business correspondence between Parvus and Hanecki, now one of the Bolshevik representatives in Stockholm. This dated from the period when both Parvus and Hanecki resided in Copenhagen. Secondly, telegrams exchanged between Hanecki in Stockholm and a well-known Petrograd barrister Kozlowski and a Petrograd business executive, Madame Sumenson, had been intercepted by the Russian counter-intelligence. In these telegrams a code had been used. Kozlowski was politically prominent as a leading Polish Social Democrat, a member of the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet, and very close to the Bolsheviks. These telegrams were regarded as evidence for treasonable money transactions between Parvus and the Bolsheviks, with Hanecki being the link. A decree signed by the Attorney General of the Provisional Government ordered the arrest of Parvus, Hanecki, Kozlowski, Mme. Sumenson, as well as that of Lenin, Zinoviev, Alexandra Kollontai, and others. Parvus and Hanecki were abroad, Lenin and Zinoviev went into hiding, the others were arrested. Soon after, Trotsky and Lunacharsky were taken to prison too. There, Trotsky made a deposition outlining his former relations with Parvus. No evidence has ever been produced of Parvus transmitting money through Hanecki to Kozlowski. In October, 1917, the Bolsheviks could point to the fact that Kozlowski and Mme. Sumenson had been released on bail by the Kerensky government. To them this was a proof that the charges had been shown to be groundless.

When Parvus hit back in a pamphlet entitled "My answer to Kerensky and Company," published in August, 1917, in Berlin, in a few words he contemptuously dismissed the charge of having given money to Lenin. The pamphlet was a bitter political attack on Kerensky and it supported the Bolshevik line in every respect. Parvus called for a separate peace as soon as possible and obviously expected the victory of the Bolsheviks in the near future. During this period he approached nearer and nearer to the Bolshevik position. His fertile brain conceived what was undoubtedly the most extraordinary idea of his life. He felt that the moment was approaching where he could enter the arena of world history. When it came to peace making between Imperial Germany and Bolshevik Russia there would be need

for a man rooted in Russian and in German socialism alike, with powerful connections with the German authorities, in short, Parvus' great moment had arrived. He must have felt that in the dreamed-of alliance between the German Social Democracy and the Russian Bolsheviks greater possibilities for historic achievements would present themselves to him if he worked on the Russian side of this alliance. All Parvus' activities in the weeks after the October Revolution which so puzzled his German friends can be explained by one idea: Parvus was energetically trying to work his passage home to the Bolsheviks.

Immediately after November 7, 1917, Parvus arranged that he be sent as official party representative to those Stockholm Bolsheviks, Radek, Vorovsky, and Hanecki, who now comprised the only embassy of the new Russia abroad, to offer them the warmest congratulations of the German Social Democrats on the occasion of the Bolshevik victory. Parvus was convinced that he could exert enough influence to have peace negotiations carried out between the German Social Democrats and the Bolsheviks. The German working class would force a peace acceptable to the Bolsheviks on the Imperial government by the threat of a general strike. In private conversation Parvus explained to Radek that he was prepared to go to Petrograd and stand trial before a revolutionary tribunal. He was certain he would convince the tribunal of his revolutionary sincerity and be allowed to place his abilities at the service of the Soviet government.

The idea of peace negotiations by socialist parties on neutral soil became inextricably linked in his mind with the chances of his personal future in Russia, and the Stockholm Bolsheviks also were eager supporters of this suggestion. Parvus scored a great success in December, 1917, when, on his initiative, Scheidemann arrived in Stockholm to have talks with Vorovsky. The German Foreign Office, however, was furious. They wanted negotiations by governments and not by socialist parties, to be held not in Stockholm but in Brest-Litovsk, and they expressed their attitude in forcible terms to Vorovsky as well as to Scheidemann. In his exalted mood Parvus did not care whether or not he jeopardized his good relations with German official circles

by his policy as he was convinced that he was on the point of being sent to Petrograd by the German Social Democrats to negotiate with Lenin and Trotsky. It was at this period that Parvus brought out a Danish translation of his "Answer to Kerensky" with a new preface. In this he acclaimed the Bolsheviks in ecstatic terms and expressed his conviction that the new regime in Russia was solidly founded. "In ten or fifteen years Russia will be the strongest and richest country in Europe." He forecast the support of the Bolshevik regime by the labor movements of Western Europe.

At the turn of the year, Parvus received the answer from Petrograd for which he had been anxiously waiting. Lenin refused his offer. This was a shattering blow and the whole elaborate structure of fantasy he had built up collapsed. His attitude towards the Bolsheviks changed overnight. His strictures on their policy spoke the language of unrequited love turned to hatred. "The new state the Bolsheviks try to establish is not socialism but a Chinese peasant state which is bound to lead to a new Tsarism. The intellectual inspirer of Lenin is not Karl Marx but Pobedonostsev," he wrote in March, 1918. Linking the Bolsheviks with the famous apologist of Russian autocracy was the worst possible insult. When, in April, 1918, Parvus published his *apologia pro vita sua* "Im Kampf um die Wahrheit," he emphasized to what extent he had turned into a German Social Democrat and with what contempt he looked on the Asiatic features of Russian life, tendencies to which Bolshevism was giving a new strength. He wrote as a disappointed man to whom the big chance of his life had been denied.

In the Weimar Republic Parvus wielded considerable influence as an *eminence grise* to President Friedrich Ebert, but the role he played after 1918 was of less importance than he felt was due to his abilities. He gradually withdrew from political and business activities. He died in December, 1924.

Two aspects of his personality contributed to rob him of the great historical achievement of which all observers thought him capable — the unresolved tension between the German and the Russian elements within him, and the importance he gave to the acquisition of personal wealth, unusual in a revolutionary. Max

Beer, whose background was similar to that of Parvus, said of him, "He genuinely liked Germany, as so many Eastern European Jews do; the German language is to them the key to Western culture, a spiritual way out of the ghetto." In the vanished world before 1914, the exile from the Kuban had fallen in love with German civilization. When the war came he felt the victory of the Germans over Russian semi-Asiatic backwardness to be a vital necessity. The tragic dividing line between advanced and under-developed countries ran straight through Parvus' soul. When the conflict came in 1914 he realized that the political development of Germany and of Russia would follow different paths, a fundamental insight that the Bolsheviks refused to share. The Russian revolutionary transformed into a German patriot did all he could to bring about the Russian defeat from within for the sake of a German triumph. When the October Revolution came, however, the emotional attraction of the new Russia proved irresistible and Parvus violently swung back to his old country, only to be rejected.

It is related of Parvus that he described himself as an inverted Midas in whose hands any gold he touched turned into dust and ashes. To get rich in order to be freed from the daily grind of the journalist, to have the time to concentrate on a great intellectual task had been his aim, but the work which would immortalize his name in the annals of political thought remained unwritten. Parvus the political writer is forgotten. The great journal with which his name would be linked as that of Herzen is with *Kolokol* failed. *Die Glocke* falls far short of such a claim. The image which survives is that of an intriguer, a political agent, and a war profiteer.

In a portrait of Parvus written by Alfred Rosenberg with a pen dipped in gall it is said that in his last years Parvus spent much of his time in teaching young Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe the German language and the German way of life. This particular detail rings true, although most of the essay is worthless. It was a modest final variation of the basic theme of Parvus' life. It is significant that men as diverse in their political philosophy as Konrad Haenisch and Karl Radek found the same words for Parvus in their obituaries — a man of the Renaissance born out of his time.

Some Observations on the 1959 Soviet Census

By VICTOR P. PETROV

AN event of tremendous importance to demographers, geographers, sociologists, and economists took place in the Soviet Union in January, 1959. We are referring to the All-Union Census of the population as of last January 15.¹ Population specialists await with great interest the results of this census, the first one in the Soviet Union in twenty years. The last had been made in 1939, just before World War II, and its complete data have never been made available.

It will probably take some time for the staff of the Soviet Statistical Office to evaluate all the information received from this latest census and only then will it be possible to trace trends in the growth of Soviet population with any amount of accuracy. Much has been revealed, however, by the above office in the preliminary results, which were published by the major Soviet newspapers on May 10, 1959. These statistics give a total figure for the population of the Soviet Union approximating 209 million (the exact figure given is 208,826,000), which is much lower than that arrived at by demographers in this country some fifteen years ago, when it was thought on the basis of scant and scarcely reliable information, that there were 220 million people in the Soviet Union at that time. This overestimate was later corrected on the basis of Soviet official pronouncements, which arrived at the lower figure of about 200 million people.

This newest count indicates that in the twenty years since the last (1939) census the population of the Soviet Union increased by 18.1 million people. This growth of population is based on the present-day territorial limits of the Soviet Union. Thus the figure of 190.7 million people given for 1939 in the Preliminary

¹*Savetskaya Rossiya*, No. 238, October 11, 1958.

Results of the Census was arrived at by the Soviet statisticians by combining population counts of the Soviet territory within its 1939 borders plus peoples of countries, which were later incorporated in the Soviet Union by annexation. However, the census of 1939, covering only Soviet territory within 1939 borders, registered 170.6 million people. Therefore the Soviet Union gained during the twenty-year period, through natural growth and by annexation of foreign territories, a total of 38.2 million people.²

It is interesting to note that while the population of the U.S.S.R., as a whole, increased by 9.5 per cent, the eastern portions of the country indicated a tremendous growth: 32 per cent in the Urals; 24 per cent in Western Siberia; 34 per cent in Eastern Siberia; 38 per cent in Central Asia and Kazakhstan; and an unprecedented growth of 70 per cent in the territories of the Soviet Far East.³

Two major republics of the Soviet Union: the Russian S.F.S.R. and the Ukrainian S.S.R. accounted for over 76.3 per cent of the entire population of the country (almost 160 million). Add to this the third major Slav republic, the Byelorussian S.S.R. with over 8,000,000 people, and we find that the three Slav republics account for over 80 per cent of the entire population of the Soviet Union. The other 20 per cent are spread over the remaining twelve Soviet republics.⁴

Another interesting aspect in the demographic picture is the fact that at the time of the 1959 Census there were 94 million men to 114.8 million women in the country, i.e. 20 million more women than men, or percentage-wise: men, 45 per cent, and women, 55 per cent of the total population. Such a high percentage of females over males can be explained, not only to losses incurred during World War II (which are the only losses cited by Soviet statisticians), but also to other, hidden, losses, which are not mentioned in official Soviet sources, namely, those attributed to the enormous numbers who perished in concentration camps. These were predominantly males, starting with the

²*Pravda*, May 10, 1959.

³*Ibid.*

⁴*Ibid.*

peasantry, which resisted collectivization, and ending with numerous arrests and liquidations during the various waves of Stalin's purges. Furthermore, of the several millions of Soviet soldiers, captured by Germans during World War II, a great number chose to remain in the West after the war ended. Another factor should not be overlooked by demographers. During the annexation of the Baltic States, enormous numbers of people from these territories escaped to Germany and other countries, and most of them were males.

Finally, the overestimated total population of the Soviet Union arrived at by Western demographers before the official data became available, is explained by the fact that not enough attention was given to the terrible famines which plagued the country several times due to forceful efforts to bring the people into the fold of "communism." The famine of 1920-1922, following the long and devastating Civil War, the famine of the early 30's, following forceful collectivization of the peasantry, and again the famine of the late 30's took an enormous toll and resulted in a sharply decreased reproduction rate.

Returning to the 1959 Census data, we notice that in spite of the predominance of women over men, the data for the younger population, i.e. people below 32 years of age, indicates about an equal proportion of men and women.

Quite a significant change over the twenty years occurred in urban versus rural population. The Preliminary Results of the 1959 Census indicate that twenty years ago, in 1939, 32 per cent of the population lived in the cities, within the present borders of the country (including territories annexed by the Soviet Union after Sept. 17, 1939), and 68 per cent under the rubric of rural population. These figures were arrived at by combining the results of the 1939 Census for the Soviet territory within its 1939 borders plus estimates for the annexed territories of Western Ukraine, Western Byelorussia, Moldavia, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. The urban population within the 1939 borders of the Soviet Union, is given as 33 per cent of the total. The new 1959 Census gives the higher figures of 48 per cent for the urban group and only 52 per cent for the

rural. Thus the distribution of population between urban and rural areas is about equalized.⁵

A detailed analysis of the 1959 Census will be possible only after the complete results have been published. Then it will be possible to study the breakdown figures of population according to sex, age, nationality, native language, education, family status, social groupings, earnings, and so on.

Before going into the manner in which the 1959 Census was conducted, it would be useful to describe the history of census-taking in Russia.

The first general census in Russia took place in 1897 and was the only All-Russian Census taken in Tsarist Russia. In spite of the fact that it was the first time this endeavor was undertaken in Russia, its results were unexpectedly good. The data received were very accurate. World War I, Revolution, and Civil War interfered with further census taking, and there was not another until 1926, *i.e.* almost thirty years after the first one of 1897. It is true that there was another census in 1920, but its goal was limited, and it was not so all-embracing as that of 1926, the first complete census conducted under the Communist regime.⁶ Besides, Civil War was still raging in the country. Next, there was another All-Union Census of 1937, soon abrogated by the Soviet Union for reasons to be described below. Two years later, in 1939, a fourth complete Soviet census was taken. Therefore, the 1959 All-Union Census was the *fifth* one, undertaken by the Soviet government.

Why, then, do the official Soviet publications quote the 1959 Census as the fourth one undertaken in Russia? An article in *Izvestiya*, the official newspaper of the Soviet government, dated July 31, 1958, stated that there were three censuses taken in the U.S.S.R., namely in 1920, 1926, and 1939. No mention was made of the comprehensive 1937 All-Union Census.⁷ The answer, perhaps, is that while the 1937 Census was much publicized at the time, when the results became known, it was severe-

⁵*Pravda*, May 10, 1959; *Novoye Vremiya*, No. 20, May 15, 1959, p. m.

⁶G. V. Selegen and M. K. Roof, *Russian Population Censuses: Methods and Concepts*, (Mimeograph), p. 1.

⁷*Izvestiya*, July 31, 1958.

ly denounced by the Communist Party and the Soviet government, and the whole undertaking was totally abrogated, mainly because of the political implications of some of the results.

It was said that, firstly, the Soviet rulers were aghast when they learned from the census results that the figure for the size of the population was considerably lower than they expected it to be as a result of natural growth. Apparently, too many people were exterminated or perished in concentration camps, and this fact was reflected in the findings. Secondly, they discovered that there was still a considerable proportion of the population, especially rural, which professed religious affiliations.

If the 1937 Census was denounced by the Soviet government as faulty, and was forcefully eradicated from the memory of the Soviet demographers, with physical extermination of those "responsible" for its results, then the "corrective" 1939 Census, accepted by the Soviet government as a true picture of Soviet population composition and trends, "became in the eyes of the West almost as infamous as the one of 1937 as a consequence of the meager details which were published in the Soviet press concerning its findings."⁸ The 1939 Census was, certainly, "doctored" to suit the needs of Stalin. It "in some respects lost the comprehensiveness and clarity of the previous censuses, because of its subordination in part to the furtherance of political objectives," said the same source.⁹

The Soviet government, in May, 1958, approved the questionnaire of the new All-Union census, which was to be conducted by 600,000 census takers for eight days, from January 15 to 22, 1959, with data collected as of the population status at 12 o'clock, midnight, January 14.¹⁰

The interest abroad in this census is understandable. According to official Soviet estimates the composition of population has greatly changed since, say, 1940. There were 60 million people classed under urban rubric in 1940, while it is estimated that this figure rose to 87 million in April, 1956. It was also officially stated that there are more than 50 million people attending

⁸G. V. Selegen & M. K. Roof, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

⁹*Ibid*

¹⁰*Vechnaya Moskva*, No. 218, September 15, 1958.

schools in the Soviet Union. Furthermore, there are 350,000 doctors, 1,800,000 in the teaching profession, and over 800,000 engineers. All these data are expected to be duly reflected in the complete results of the 1959 Census.¹¹

According to *Vechernaya Moskva*, a trial census in seven selected districts of the country was undertaken on August 1, 1957. These districts, more or less, reflected various geographic and economic conditions of the country, as well as in composition and density of population.¹² The ratio of urban versus rural population certainly experienced great changes in the last twenty years, as demonstrated in the preliminary results. From 1939 to 1957, 417 new cities and towns appeared on the map of the Soviet Union. In addition, 1,188 town-type settlements were added.¹³ The 1959 figures show that a total of 1,857 new cities and towns together with town-type settlements appeared in the country between 1939 and 1959.¹⁴

The 600,000 census takers were specially trained school teachers, university and college students, as well as seniors in special "technikums." The rural data was collected by the technical staff of the MTS, RTS, Sovkhozes, Kolkhozes, and other institutions. They were released from their regular duties for the duration of the task,¹⁵ and the procedure was as follows: They first made a "dry-run" of their districts from January 11 to 14 to acquaint themselves with the areas assigned to them, and to determine accurately the limits of their districts, so that there could be no overlapping or overlooked households.¹⁶ The census taker was required to meet *personally* every adult in his district during the eight days of counting. No matter when the census taker met the individual, he was to enter data of his whereabouts, as of the night of January 14-15, 1959, at midnight, to be precise.¹⁷ Children born after midnight of that date were not entered on the questionnaire, while people who spent that par-

¹¹*Izvestiya*, May 7, 1958.

¹²*Vechernaya Moskva*, No. 218, September 15, 1958.

¹³*Izvestiya*, May 7, 1958.

¹⁴*Pravda*, May 10, 1959.

¹⁵*Izvestiya*, May 7, 1958.

¹⁶*Vechernaya Moskva*, No. 218, Sept. 15, 1958.

¹⁷*Ibid.*

ticular night in the house under question were recorded. Thus the actual, physical presence of a person in the house was recorded, notwithstanding the fact that he or she was not a resident of the house.¹⁸ This fact is very important for an accurate count of the entire population, in the opinion of Soviet demographers, since there were ten persons born every minute in the Soviet Union, in 1957, while three persons died. Therefore, the population of the country increases by seven persons a minute, or almost ten thousand people during a twenty-four-hour period.¹⁹ The accuracy of census taking was checked by special instructors-inspectors who conducted a repeat run of every building visited by the census takers.

January 15th was selected as the date for the census because it fell in the middle of the week, when the population was less mobile or fluid than during weekends, ensuring better accuracy. Furthermore, on this date university students were not yet at their respective schools. In addition, the month of January is good for economic planning and forecasting since it shows conditions existing at the beginning of the year.²⁰

There were fifteen questions asked: relationship to the head of the family; if a person was temporarily absent, he was accordingly entered as such; a temporary resident was instructed to indicate his permanent residence, and how long he had been absent from it; sex; age (for children less than one year, age in months); married or single; nationality; native language, citizenship; education (those attending school were to give the full name of the school); place of work; occupation or position (if not employed, then source of livelihood to be given); and, finally, the society group he belonged to: worker, employee, farmer (kolkhoz peasant), cooperative craftsman or artisan, member of a free profession, or servant of a religious organization.²¹

How accurate and how reliable was the data collected only the future will tell, and demographers the world over are waiting the complete results with great interest.

¹⁸*Ibid.*

¹⁹*Ibid.*

²⁰*Vechernaya, Moskva*, No. 218, Sept. 15, 1958.

²¹*Ibid.*

Book Reviews

RADKEY, OLIVER H. *The Agrarian Foes of Bolshevism*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1958. 521 pp. \$8.50.

The need for studies of Russian political parties is obvious to anyone who has worked in the field of modern Russian history: strictly speaking, we do not dispose of full-length, scholarly studies of any major Russian party in either Russian or a Western language. The Socialist-Revolutionaries are no exception. True, there is a history of that party published by an official of the tsarist police, Spiridovich (which, curiously enough, Mr. Radkey, lists — and dismisses — in his bibliography only in the French edition of 1930, rather than in the complete second Russian edition, published in Petrograd in 1918)—but that book emphasizes heavily the terroristic activities of the SR's, and is in many respects more a collection of materials than a history. Mr. Radkey's book is therefore, in a way, a pioneer effort. It subjects to minute scrutiny the activities of the SR's in a single year, 1917, when they won their greatest popularity, and also suffered their greatest defeat. The causes and the course of that rise and fall are the special problems to which this book addresses itself. It is a serious undertaking, based on over twenty-five years of research in the printed sources and personal interviews with the surviving leaders of the party. There is a professional quality about this monograph that is all

too often lacking in works dealing with Russian history.

And yet, when all is said and done, Mr. Radkey's book is a disappointment. The reason lies in methodology, or, more concretely, in a conception of history that is at once too narrow and too broad.

To begin with the too-narrow aspects of his method: History, as Mr. Radkey presents it here, is primarily an account of the interminable party squabbles, factions (at one point, no fewer than five), programmatic debates, voting results, with very little attention given to the psychological, socio-economic, and cultural factors involved. At no point in his account does the author give evidence of an awareness of the limits within which the SR leaders had to operate it, be it because of traditions, pressures from below, the general political situation, or even their own sense of responsibility to Russia. Surely, even the history of a party cannot be written as it were in an environmental vacuum. The introduction, which contains a very useful account of the growth of the SR party after 1900, says next to nothing of its link with the older Populist tradition, especially as it evolved in the 1890's. In dealing with terrorism, an essential feature of SR politics, no attempt is made to explain why they engaged in it, while in dealing with the SR attitude toward the minority population neither the practical nor the theoretical aspects of the minority question in twentieth-century Russia are discussed.

At all points in the narrative when the reader looks to the author for guidance in explaining why certain events took place, he is disappointed. This is because Mr. Radkey has understood the scope of party history in a far too narrow sense: certainly histories of Western political parties written today do not display such a two-dimensional quality.

If in his conception of party history Mr. Radkey is too narrow, then in his conception of the historian's general function he tends to be too broad. Had he confined himself to writing a history of the inner party workings he would have given us a book which, while not fully satisfying our curiosity, would at least have provided an objective, balanced account of one aspect of SR history. But the author has also very strong moral judgment on people and events, a judgment which frequently interferes with his analysis and presentation. Perhaps nothing characterizes this attitude better than the title of the concluding chapter: "Mistakes and Weaknesses in 1917." There, rather than provide a balanced account of the factors operating in the history of the SR's, he gives us, what he himself calls a "catalogue of errors": the failure to build up a homogeneous party; the lack of firm leadership; overestimation of the Kadets, combined with underestimation of the Bolsheviks; and, above all, failure to make peace. For Mr. Radkey is a pacifist, and in his account of SR policies toward the war problem in 1917 there are suggestions that the failure to make peace brought down upon the SR the wrath of heaven. While he has a perfect right to his opinions, he ought not to impose them upon the reader, who is con-

siderably bothered when the author exercises the dual functions of prosecutor and judge; the more so, that the defendants are nearly all dead and cannot speak for themselves. This quality is especially troublesome because the author does not show the empathy in regard to the subjects of his book which would make his judgment balanced, and therefore convincing.

Perhaps twenty-five years is too long a time to work on any historical subject: perhaps it induces the historian to become so closely involved in the affairs with which he deals that it robs him of the sense of detachment that every historian must possess. If so, it is a great pity, because it is not likely that anyone will soon again venture to go over the materials to the study of which Mr. Radkey has devoted so much time and effort. Should he continue the history of the SR party, it is to be hoped that he will give us the facts — all the facts, not only those dealing with party factions, programs, and voting records — and let them speak for themselves.

RICHARD PIPES

Harvard University

VERNADSKY, GEORGE. *The Origins of Russia*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1959. 354 pp. 35/s.

Upon reading this new book by the eminent Yale historian, Professor George Vernadsky, this reviewer was agreeably surprised to find that *The Origins of Russia* is not an abridged or modified edition of Professor Vernadsky's monumental *Ancient Russia* or *Kievan Russia* but is the product of an entirely new research. Professor Vernadsky

offers in this new book primarily a cultural background of Russia and summarizes the results of the latest investigations in the field of early East European and Asian history. The reader will encounter once again Professor Vernadsky's theory regarding the decisive impact of nomadic — especially Alanic — culture on Russia, but this time the cultural and spiritual ties between the East Slavs and their neighbors rather than politics have attracted the attention of the author.

One of the most important and daring new hypotheses in this work is the conjecture that the Slavs, Goths, and Scandinavians migrated from Central Asia to Europe in two successive waves. No less interesting are the comparisons Professor Vernadsky draws between the prehistoric Slavic pagan religion and the Iranian cult of Mitra. Both worshipped the sun, as is reflected by the name of the Slavic god Svarozhich (*svar* meaning sun or light in old Indic; hence, Svarozhich—child of the Sun or of Light) to be found in the Serbian tale on the Tsar Sun; and in the affectionate poetic name for Prince Vladimir in the bylinas — “*Krasnoe Solnyshko*,” the beautiful Sun. It may also be that the ancient Russian Book of Profound Wisdom (*Glubinnaya Kniga*) which treats the origin of the world and of the sun, equally has its roots in Mitraic or even pre-Mitraic religious philosophy and cosmogony. A great many other interesting and provocative hypotheses are made in this work, which covers Russia's past from its earliest beginnings to the time of Vladimir, but it is impossible even to enumerate or summarize them all in a short book review.

Some features of this work may

tend to create some perplexities, however, which might easily be avoided. For instance, although Professor Vernadsky studies almost all the possible cultural influences on the early Russian population, he does not investigate thoroughly enough, in the opinion of this reviewer, the impact of the Pontic Greek colonies on the culture and urban settlements of the eastern Slavs. M. Rostovtsev, in his *Iranians and Greeks in Southern Russia* (Oxford, 1925) pointed to the influence of the Greek cities on the civilization and, especially, urban life of the peoples of present-day southern Russia but little has been done since then to clarify this problem. A historian of Professor Vernadsky's erudition and perception might have closed this still existing gap in knowledge of the origins of Russian urban communities and their dependence on Pontic Greek urban patterns.

A certain confusion arises from the consistent but insufficiently defined use of the term “Russes” in place of “Russians” in denoting the population of the Kievan state, especially since such expressions as “early Russian state,” “Kievan Russian culture” and “early Russian religion” are used simultaneously. The use of the simple term “Russians” might probably be more justifiable. It is also difficult to accept the assumption that in the ninth to tenth centuries the Alans continued to play a certain role in Russian society. There is hardly any proof of their continued existence by that time on the territories occupied by Russians, although apparently they still were not quite absorbed by the Turkic nomads in the Volga regions, the Kazakh steppes and, especially, in the northern Caucasus.

Finally, a question may be raised whether the use of Scandinavian names by the Russian upper strata in the ninth to eleventh centuries necessarily indicates that their bearers were of Norse origin. This could merely reflect an influence or passing vogue exercised by the Scandinavians on the Russian *druzhina* and local aristocracy. In any case, we know that the use of Greek names by Russians in the following centuries only reflected Byzantine Christian influence and not the supremacy of Greek settlers over Russians.

Such puzzles inevitably arise in reading and writing on the complicated origins of Russia, and they certainly show how far we are from a well-established and generally accepted view of early Slavic history. In any case, historians will be grateful to Professor Vernadsky for this new re-examination of ancient Russian history in the light of modern discoveries.

SERGE A. ZENKOVSKY
Stetson University

ZEMAN, Z. A. B. [Ed.] *Germany and the Revolution in Russia, 1915-1918. Documents from the Archives of the German Foreign Ministry.* London, Oxford University Press, 1958. 157 pp. 25/s.

In 1955 the publisher Martinus Nijhoff at The Hague opened a subscription for a documentary publication entitled *Imperial Germany's Efforts towards Peace During the First World War. Documents from the Archives of the German Foreign Ministry, August 1914 to January 31, 1917*, which had been prepared by André Scherer and Jacques Grunewald, both members

of the French team in the inter-Allied German Foreign Ministry Documents Project. The estimated size of the work was 900 pages, the subscription price 50 guilders; a minimum of 500 subscribers was needed for a limited edition. Unfortunately, subscriptions fell far behind the publisher's expectation and a carefully prepared and much needed documentary work of prime importance for the history of secret diplomacy during the First World War has remained unpublished. Instead we have received the rather slender volumes of Werner Hahlweg, *Lenins Rückkehr nach Russland 1917. Die deutschen Akten.* Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1957, 139 pp. (Studies in East European History, v. 4) and Zeman's collection, here under review, which illuminate one aspect only of Germany's peace efforts: The efforts based on contacts with the Russian revolutionary socialist movement, with the ultimate aim of overthrowing the tsarist regime and of concluding a separate peace with a new, docile Russian government.

Although both collections cover a long stretch of Germany's war against tsarist Russia (Hahlweg: 100 documents, September 7, 1914 to July 11, 1917; Zeman: 136 documents, January 1, 1915 to June 25, 1918), the numerous attempts made to negotiate a peace between the Kaiser's and the Tsar's governments are not covered (except for editorial remarks in Zeman's book, p. 23 and p. 92). This means that it is rather difficult to assess the relevance of the two limited collections of documents within the general framework of German war diplomacy 1914-1917 which tried to split the Allies and which aided subversive movements in several parts

of the world, notably in Ireland and India. With the Scherer-Grünwald collection at our disposal, we probably would be in a better position to evaluate the Russian aspects of the German efforts. The German legations at Berne (Freiherr von Romberg), Stockholm (Freiherr von Lucius), and Copenhagen (Count Brockdorff-Rantzau) emerge as centers of German clandestine activities; an extremely interesting chapter could be written in a biography of Brockdorff-Rantzau, the prototype of impeccable diplomat famous by wearing a stylish, incredibly high stiff collar, about his war-time dealings with soft-collar men coming from very different strata of society.

The documents of the Zeman collection have been analyzed by several scholars, among them F. L. Carsten in *Problems of Communism* (Vol. 8, no. 1, Jan.-Feb. 1959, pp. 44-48) and Alfred G. Meyer in the *American Slavic and East European Review* (Vol. 18, no. 2, April 1959, pp. 271-72). As to the point of the greatest historical significance this reviewer agrees with the considered judgment of the editor (in the Introduction and in his article in *Der Monat*, Sept. 1958) and of the reviewers named above: No evidence has been unearthed from which could be adduced that Lenin, although "unscrupulous about German aid" (Carsten), was a German agent. If thus it can be said that Zeman cements the opinion of scholars who have expressed themselves as being at variance with long and widely-held propagandistic views — simultaneously anti-German and anti-Bolshevik — of a "German-Bolshevik conspiracy," unfortunately serious objections must be raised against the manner in

which the documents are presented.

The fact that the Hahlweg and the Zeman collections have twenty-nine documents in common, makes it possible to compare the original German version as given by Hahlweg with the translations (which, according to the preface, are mostly the work of Mr. Dietrich Pevsner). In analyzing, for instance, Doct. 6 (Romberg to Bethmann-Hollweg, Sept. 30, 1915) of Zeman's collection (Hahlweg Doct. 3), besides smaller points the following doubtful translations must be noted: Point 4 of Lenin's alleged peace program asking for "volle Autonomie der Nationalitäten" is translated as "Full autonomy for all nationalities" which was the interpretation of this point (see Hahlweg p. 40, note 7). The Socialists "Dneveinski, Mark Kachel, Olgin" (Zeman p. 6, none of them identified) appear in the German version (Hahlweg p. 41) as "Dnewniensky, Mark, Olgin, Kachel" and are identified as P. Dnevnickii (F. O. Cederbaum), Mark, Olgin (M. Fomin) and K. Kacheli. While the last sentence in the telegram in the original version asks *not* to discuss (except for its French aspect) with the agent Keskiula the use to be made of the information which he had given to Romberg, the translation asserts the opposite. Or, if we take Zeman Doct. 46 (Romberg to the Foreign Ministry, April 14, 1917) which is Doct. 10 in Hahlweg: Romberg reports that Nationalrat Grimm has "einige Beziehungen zur russischen und französischen äussersten Linken"; this is translated as "close relations" (Zeman p. 47). The editor does not know that at this time no Social Democrats were members of the imperial German government; the

expression "Regierungs-Sozialisten" used for the "majority" Social Democrats, is translated "the Socialists in our government." Even worse, the "Arbeitsgemeinschaft," the Haase-Ledebour group of former majority Socialists (also mentioned in Zeman Doct. 28, i.e., Hahlweg Doct. 36), is translated "the German workers' community." In Doct. 49 (Romberg to Foreign Ministry, April 16, 1917; Hahlweg Doct. 13) "Deutschlands Völkerrechtsverletzungen" is translated as "German violations of Human Rights!"

There are to be found in this edition so many other inaccuracies or plain mistakes that scholars who have not at their disposal the German version of a particular document as printed by Hahlweg, would be well-advised to consult the microfilms and not to trust implicitly the English translations.

FRITZ T. EPSTEIN

The Library of Congress

WALSH, WARREN B. *Russia and the Soviet Union*. Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press, 1958. 590 pp. \$10.00.

A historian can be given no harder task than to write a general history of a great Empire. Professor Warren Walsh's *Russia and the Soviet Union* is a serious, if not a completely successful attempt to give the general reader, or a college student, a systematic account of modern Russian history.

The book quite appropriately begins with chapters outlining the geography and the origins of Russia, the history of the Kievan and the Tatar periods, the rise of the Muscovite State, and the consolidation of Tsarist absolutism. This

introductory material is indispensable for a proper understanding of Russia's subsequent history and forms an integral and valuable part of the book. The chapter on Ivan the Terrible is a case in point. It was during Ivan's reign that the struggle between the monarchy and the aristocracy came to a head; it was also at this time that Russia began, by conquering Kazan and Astrakhan, to transform herself from a nation-state into an empire. Parenthetically, one might note that, contrary to the author's assertion, the conquest of Siberia, traditionally attributed to Yermak, was actually carried out some fifteen years later in Boris Godunov's reign by the Volvoda Andrei Voeikov.

The nineteenth and twentieth centuries receive a detailed and comprehensive treatment. Domestic politics, social changes, the fate of the peasants before and after the Emancipation, the *Zemstvo*, and other institutions are presented competently and well. Foreign policy is not neglected, the treatment of the complicated Eastern question being especially successful. Unfortunately Russia's eastward expansion does not receive the same attention. The two pages devoted to the conquest of Central Asia are inadequate, while of the conquest of the Caucasus Professor Walsh says: "The motivation was mainly commercial; a desire to reach and tap the trade along the old silk road from India to the West. Explorers and pioneers were followed by Cossacks and by other military forces who built fortresses and maintained garrisons. Then came colonists and bureaucrats and the merging of the region into the empire." (p. 220).

All of this is quite accurate of Si-

beria, but misleading when applied to the Caucasus which had to be subdued mile by mile, mountain by mountain, valley by valley. In Transcaucasia Armenia and Azerbaijan were acquired without cosacks, pioneers, traders, bureaucrats, fort-building, or commercial penetration. Neither was this the way in which Georgia was annexed. It is a pity that the author did not consult Baddley's work on the conquest of the Caucasus and David Lang's monograph on Georgia. The subject peoples of the Russian empire, be they Georgians or Uzbeks, are very much ignored by Professor Walsh. In this respect Soviet historians take a broader and more realistic view, attempting to write the history of an agglomeration of peoples rather than that of the Great Russian nation.

When dealing with the Soviet period, in which history imperceptibly merges with current affairs, Professor Walsh admirably succeeds in maintaining a high degree of objectivity. Though documentation grows ever more difficult as the story approaches the present, the author stands on solid ground throughout. Perhaps in his attempt to be scrupulously fair he has not sufficiently emphasized that the Constitution of 1936 was only a sham, or that the confessions in the Great Purge were often obtained by physical torture, the latter fact having been admitted by Khrushchev at the XXth Party Congress.

Throughout the book one comes across a number of minor inaccuracies. Thus it is stated that if Tsarevich Aleksei Nikolaevich died, "The male line of the dynasty died too" (p. 309), which would not have been the case for a number of male Romanovs were alive and in good

health. Dealing with the division of Persia into spheres of influence in 1907, the author speaks of "a Russian sphere in the north (where the oil is)" . . . (p. 353). In fact the oil was in the south in the neutral zone. O.G.P.U. is said to stand for the Unified State Political Police while the initials stood for Unified State Political Administration.

The spelling of Russian words and names throughout the book is inconsistent and at times bewildering, too many typographical errors having been permitted to creep in. Thus Riazan is consistently rendered as Riazin (p. 50 and elsewhere), Matveiev is Matviev (p. 103), Aleksei is Alexius and Alexis on the same page (p. 125). Khvostov (p. 368) appears also as Kvostov (p. 348). *Tsarstvovanie* is spelled *Tsarvovanie* (p. 623), *issledovanie* becomes *izledovanie* (ibid.), *razgrom* turns into *rasgrom* (p. 624), *Dardanelly* is *Dardanell* even in the nominative case (p. 628). Peasants are said to have been "sub-divided" (why not divided?) into *barshchina* and *obrochny*, the first is a noun, the second an adjective. If one chooses *barshchina*, one should have *obrok*, if *obrochnyi* then *barshchinnyi*.

Such slips are, of course, trivial. They do not affect the substance of the book which can serve as a good introduction to Russian history.

F. KAZEMZADEH

Yale University

MALOZEMOFF, ANDREW. *Russian Far-Eastern Policy, 1881-1904. With Special Emphasis on the Causes of the Russo-Japanese War.* Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1958. 358 pp. \$5.00.

It was, comparatively speaking, not so long ago when on May 8, 1940, a British historian, the late Professor B. H. Sumner, gave a lecture at the British Academy on "Tsarism and Imperialism" which was published in the Proceedings of the British Academy. Professor Sumner called to mind the once existing aspirations of some Russian statesmen to gain possession of a warm-water port in the Korean archipelago for Russia's Pacific fleet. "Down to 1900," asserted Mr. Sumner, "the Chinese Eastern Railway had, as regards Russian concerns, the sole right to concessions in Manchuria but at that time Bezobrazov succeeded in smashing this monopoly and founding the East-Asiatic Company with assignments to it from the Tsar's private chancellery — counterpart of his fatally imperialistic Yalu Timber Company."

Sumner's analysis and conclusion is a typical appraisal of the Russian Far-Eastern Policy and the causes of the Russo-Japanese War not only by foreign but also by Russian historians. A. Malozemoff has succeeded in refuting the traditional point of view. In his well-documented book he describes the same events with more details and with references to earlier unknown or little-known sources. On the basis of a cautious and objective analysis Malozemoff has succeeded in proving that the Bezobrazov adventure lost all official support before it

could have materialized, and that the concession on the Yalu River had little significance compared with the extensive Japanese and American enterprises in Korea. (pp. 163-165; 173, 174).

The book under review is not only meritorious for the author's thorough study and re-evaluation of all data and available sources, but also for his able presentation of the historical background of various events. For example, speaking about the need for a Trans-Siberian railroad as a defense against potential aggression, Malozemoff offers a very good survey of the Russian, British, and Chinese relations in regard to Korea (pp. 1-40). Although the book is devoted primarily to Russian Far-Eastern policy it describes as well the policy of England, Germany, Japan, and the United States. Thus it embraces a wide range of questions concerning imperialist policy and rivalry in the Far-East at the end of the last century and the beginning of the present; namely, the Russian, British and Japanese expansion, the Boxer Rebellion, and the United States Open Door Policy.

GEORGE C. GUINS
Washington, D. C.

SAUNDERS, COMMANDER M.G. RN
(Ed.) *The Soviet Navy.* New York, Praeger, 1958. 340pp. \$7.50.

This book fills a long-felt need, and does it competently and satisfactorily. Since very little authoritative and systematic material is available on the Soviet Navy, while a good deal of inaccurate and misleading information is being broadcast, the authors and publishers deserve credit for undertaking this

important task.

As a motto for the book the editor chose a statement made by Marshall Zhukov in 1956, when he was Soviet Minister of Defense: "In a future war the struggle at sea will be of even greater importance than it was in the last war."

This assertion, typical of many such pronouncements by Soviet leaders in the past few years, is a good indication of the great value that Soviet leaders put upon sea power in modern war — in contrast to the doubt about its continued efficacy expressed by some military experts in the West.

If Mr. Khrushchev has been heard more recently to belittle naval power as being something outmoded in the era of ICBM's and thermonuclear weapons, this must not be taken too literally because at the same time the Soviet Union persists in building up a large and efficient navy, paying particular attention to submarines. In fact, as far as the number of its ships is concerned, the Soviet Union now occupies second place among the naval powers of today.

In an introduction and fifteen chapters the book covers not only many aspects of the present Soviet Navy, but also — and very appropriately — its history and, in fact, the whole complex of Russian sea power. Hanson W. Baldwin, the Military Editor of *The New York Times* and well-known authority on naval affairs, discusses The Strategic Background of the Soviet Navy; Admirals Ernest M. Eller, USN, and A. D. Nicholl, RN, deal with the main lines of Soviet naval strategy; Captain Donald Macintyre, a British authority on submarine warfare, writes of the Soviet submarines as a threat to the West. Geog-

raphy, the Merchant Marine, Bases, the Organization, Ships, and Personnel of the present Soviet Navy, its Technology and Weapons, Strategic Concepts and Capabilities, are treated in other chapters by various distinguished experts in the respective fields. Contributions by German, Swedish, Turkish, and Japanese writers, looking at the subject from their national point of view, add special interest to the book. Considering that their countries may be the first targets of a Soviet naval campaign and that they had many contacts and dealings with Russian naval forces in the past, their experience may contain valuable lessons for the West in general. Additional chapters by British and American authors are concerned with Geopolitics and other pertinent aspects of Soviet sea power.

As is to be expected in a collaborative effort, not all chapters are written equally well, and there are some overlappings and gaps. For instance, there is little discussion of the sea lanes which are, or might become, of vital importance to Soviet Russia; neither is there much attention to the Soviet Union's dependence on the sea, economically or militarily. If, however, sea power is basically the control of sea lanes and the ability to use them for economic and military purposes, sea routes and their uses for the Soviet Union should be made the central point of interest. Ships and bases, after all, only exist to make possible such use. Ports and harbors are mentioned under "Soviet Merchant Ships," and again under "Geography and Strategy," yet in the end the reader may still lack a clear picture of the system of bases on which the Soviet Navy must de-

pend. This is due partly to the absence of good maps which would have been of particular help in connection with these chapters.

But these are minor matters. For anyone interested in military affairs, and especially with the role of sea power in the modern world, the book is a "must." At present it is the best available source of information on the Soviet Navy.

A. E. SOKOL

Stanford University

JACKSON, LT. COL. W. G. F. *Seven Roads to Moscow*. New York, Philosophical Library, 1958. 334 pp. \$7.50.

Of all the major attempts at conquering Russia from the West, only one — that of Rurik and the Varangians — really (*sic!*) succeeded; thus argues Lt. Colonel Jackson, formerly instructor at the Sandhurst Royal Military Academy. This was because the Varangians followed and took advantage of the river route, instead of trying to break across it. All the other would-be conquerors, especially Charles XII, Napoleon, and Hitler, failed mainly for the following reasons: the unmanageable vastness of the country and its poor roads and primitive economy; the Russians' ability to replenish their manpower; the failure to destroy Russian military power at one blow because of Russian avoidance of decisive encounters; the neglect of political goals which might have prevented the patriotic surge of popular resistance. From these observations Lt. Colonel Jackson concludes: "Let us hope that no one will ever be tempted to emulate Charles, Napoleon, or Hitler in imposing a mil-

itary solution of a kind which history has shown must fail, and which may well bring nuclear annihilation to mankind." (p. 319). This reviewer, though a layman in military matters, is not impressed at all. If the Colonel means to say that conquest of *all* of Russia, mile by mile, by means of traditional warfare is impossible, then he is only repeating what everybody — if he is not utterly blind or stupid — knows already. But is such a course still likely in the age of atomic and hydrogen bombs and ICBM's? Furthermore, as his own observations and evidence show, limited military aims and good political tactics might have resulted in an appreciably different picture, at least in the cases of Napoleon and Hitler. What, then, is the point of the book?

The bulk of the volume is devoted to a rather detailed, but clear and lively description of the military operations of the three major invaders of Russia from the West. The lion's share is taken by the campaigns of Hitler and Napoleon. The author makes all the obvious and well-known comparisons between the circumstances, plans, and errors in Napoleon's and Hitler's conduct of the invasion. None of this will be news for anyone somewhat familiar with Russian history. The reader who knows something of the workings of the Russian government and army will be a bit puzzled by the author's ready assumption of the purposefulness and careful planning of every Russian move and decision. Tolstoy's scepticism as to the value of military science and planning may have been exaggerated, but it would have served as a healthy corrective to Jackson's excessively rationalistic

voluntarism. Furthermore, as the author states himself in his bibliographical note, he has drawn mainly on French and German sources. Thus he not only looks at the events from the point of view of the invader, but he also ignores or underestimates the genuine problems and conditions (not all military) which the Russian leadership had to face. It is certainly naive to disregard the social and political elements in accounting for the Russian reactions to Napoleon's and Hitler's invasions.

Lt. Colonel Jackson's ignorance of Russian (and even European) history seriously detracts from even the limited value his book may have as a readable account of selected military operations. It would be both ungenerous and tedious to catalogue the errors, hasty generalizations, and false clichés which dot every one of the passages dealing with historical background and "analysis." The first book (*The Older Roads*, pp. 3-23) is not only valueless but also highly misleading. True, some errors may have been due to misprints, but some are really unforgivable. The brief bibliography (pp. vii-viii) shows the shakiness of the author's foundations by its very superficiality. For historical background and the early periods, Jackson has contented himself with Pares', Sumner's, Beazley's, and Vernadsky's—incidentally misspelled as Kernadsky—surveys, as well as the Cambridge Modern History and Cambridge History of Poland vol. II.

Quousque tandem abutere patientia nostra and when shall authors treat the facts of Russian history with the same degree of respect and knowledge that they

would demand in any discussion of Western affairs?

MARC RAEFF

Clark University

McLANE, CHARLES B. *Soviet Policy and the Chinese Communists, 1931-1946*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1958. 310 pp. \$5.50.

There has to date been inadequate systematic study of overt Soviet materials dealing with the relation of the Chinese Communist movement to the headquarters of world Communism in Moscow. Fortunately Professor McLane has now provided us with a study covering the years 1931-1946, and it is unlikely that anyone will have to cover this aspect of the story again. In a comprehensive survey covering this fifteen-year period he has packed much information and presented us with the insights that come from a wealth of research and well-mustered data. His work is amply documented—the footnotes themselves frequently present interesting sidelights on the story of a complicated subject. Dr. McLane has divided his work into five chapters, each a clearly thought-out and logically argued essay. These point toward three general conclusions about Moscow's relations with the Chinese Communists which he spells out in succinct form at the end of the book: (1) "there is no clear evidence that the Russians made any strenuous efforts during this period to intervene in the internal political affairs of the Chinese Communist Party in support of one faction or another," (2) "there is no good evidence that the Chinese Communists . . . ever used

their independence either to evade Soviet policies which they may have found objectionable or to refute formulations in Marxism-Leninism which the Kremlin endorsed as dogma valid for Communists everywhere," and (3) "there is no occasion after . . . January, 1931, when the Russians are known to have expressed their disapproval of Chinese Communist policies, as they had done frequently and caustically during the previous decade."

Professor McLane points frankly to two difficulties present in making this study: the scarcity of data revealing the working relationships between Moscow and local Communist parties, and the necessity for him to rely on English and Russian language materials as far as the Chinese Communists themselves are concerned. Within the framework of overt Soviet publications and Comintern documents, however, he has researched thoroughly and written clearly.

This reviewer has had opportunity to interview Chinese leaders deeply involved in the events of the period and to consult Chinese documents dealing with it which would tend to give some different interpretations. For example, an interview with Chang Kuo-t'ao on July 11, 1952, brought out some interesting data on the direct relations and especially radio communication between Yen-an and Moscow beginning in 1936. Chang related that after the Sian kidnapping of Chiang Kai-shek, which the Communists had encouraged, Yen-an was on the point of asking Moscow for further instructions when a message came from Stalin via Mongolia ordering the Chinese Communists to help effect his release. Again, a unique collection of Chi-

nese literature from Manchuria — much of it printed in Chinese in the Soviet Union — covering the period 1945-1949 acquired by the Yale University Library indicates a Soviet commitment to and confidence in the Chinese Communist movement's eventual victory earlier than the mid-1946 date arrived at by McLane on the basis of overt Soviet sources. Again, there is now refugee testimony on the Soviet training schools for young Chinese Communists which could have helped Professor McLane to scuttle the myth of the supposed isolation of Yen-an.

Certain minor items of omission and disagreement should be noted. In this reviewer's opinion McLane does not give close enough attention to the relationship of united front policies in China to the general world united front policies of the Kremlin, nor does he cover the changes in Chinese Communist policy occasioned by Munich. Although the full impact of the Chinese Communist forces which entered Manchuria from Soviet territory under Li Li-san has yet to be assessed, surely the role of this Soviet-sponsored army deserves at least passing mention. Again, this reviewer feels that the full extent of the Stalinization of the Chinese Communist Party during the early 1940's is not sufficiently appreciated. Such items, however, do not detract from the fine job of synthesis McLane has done on Soviet publications dealing with the Chinese Communists. A useful appendix lists Chinese Communist declarations on Japanese aggression and on the formation of a united front appearing in Soviet publications between 1931 and 1937.

RICHARD L. WALKER

University of South Carolina

STEINER, GEORGE. *Dostoevsky or Tolstoy. An Essay in the Old Criticism*. New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1959. 354 pp. \$5.75.

When a sensitive, imaginative reader who is not a specialist in Russian literature addresses himself to Dostoevsky and Tolstoy, the results may not always be valid, but they can hardly be dull. Mr. Steiner's book offers genuine insights into certain novels, interesting comments on aspects of novelistic technique, and significant contributions to problems of literary history; concomitantly, it attempts to foist on the reader pompous generalizations on the artistic temperament, religious thought (particularly Russian), the epic, tragedy, and criticism.

The interrogative particle in the title replaces the more conventional and comfortable conjunction in order to emphasize the contrast between two writers so radically different that "they solicit from their readers fierce and often mutually exclusive adherence" (p. 321). The sub-title preëmpts for the author those notions of admiration, moral purpose, philosophical temper, and concern for totality of meaning ostensibly absent from "new criticism."

Merezhkovsky's opposition of Dostoevsky to Tolstoy as the opposition of spiritual to physical, of dramatic to epic, abetted by V. Ivanov's and Berdyaev's criticism, is here pressed to untenable extremes. Mr. Steiner's exposition of the epic vision in Homer and its counterpart in Tolstoy (p. 74 ff.) is both interesting and revealing; as in the more limited treatment of tragedy and its relation to Dostoevsky, however, it is a peculiarly mod-

ern view that disregards, because it cannot use or does not know, the historical and linguistic setting of the original. The shallow historical perspective — sometimes completely absent — not only here but also in treating the relationship of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky to their era, distorts, the "eternal verities" Mr. Steiner seeks and ably expounds. It contradicts the author's grim search for precedent to account for everything in the two authors, somewhat akin to Passage's recent book on Dostoevsky and Hoffmann, which Mr. Steiner apparently endorses.

The reader who does not have access to L. Grossman's and Vinogradov's work will be grateful for the analysis of the traditional gothic tale and *feuilleton* in Dostoevsky, and even those who do will find significant additional information gleaned from the author's wide acquaintance with primary and secondary sources. Particularly interesting is the application of Mario Praz's categories of infernal women and sadism to Dostoevsky. There is a fruitful discussion of coincidence in Tolstoy, of the depiction and significance of the theater as the propagator of society's illusions and conventions within Tolstoy's novels (p. 117 ff.), an elaborate analysis of structure, motivation, and themes at the beginning of *Anna Karenina*, and a paradoxical view of Stavrogin as God which, if overdone and onesided, still explains much that was hitherto puzzling in that strange figure. The smaller the unit, the better Mr. Steiner's treatment. An excellent exegesis of three passages in *War and Peace* (p. 268 ff.) shows Tolstoy's failure to explain certain states of mind, but even more clearly shows how

the surrounding material makes possible a flat assertion of spiritual change. There are innumerable felicitous *aperçus*, frequently duplicating the best in Russian criticism of the two writers.

When Mr. Steiner deals with the larger problems that give the book its shape, the reader will be repelled by gross exaggeration and by a dogmatic manner. The title and sub-title hint at an impishness that the turgid prose soon demonstrates to be perverse. One of the tasks of the "old criticism" is to restore and guard "the health of language and sensibility" (p. 4). Mr. Steiner prefers to use adjectives as nouns and vice-versa, to obliterate the gentle distinction between transitive and intransitive. He exults in the precision of words, sometimes with conspicuous success, but frequently only irritating (in his vocabulary "literally" means "figuratively"). When he is on sure ground, regardless of the subject's complexity, his prose can become a clear and efficient instrument. More frequently, it distorts meaning. If the underground man defines man as an ungrateful biped, Mr. Steiner writes "The subterranean narrator defines his species as 'A creature which walks on two legs and is devoid of gratitude'" (p. 230). If Mr. Steiner were not so raucously insistent, the reader would object less to glaring errors of judgment: his view of the first epilogue of *War and Peace*; of information: "if Dostoevsky wrote an anti-Tolstoy novel, no trace of it remains" (p. 328); of authority: "Thomas Mann was right in asserting that the commanding impulse behind *Anna Karenina* is moralistic" (p. 282); of synesthesia: our response to a scene in Henry James' *The Golden Bowl* is "of a

musical or architectural order" (p. 177); of parenthetical pontification: "the quadrille is a *figura* [sic] (the old rhetoric had terms which we forego at our peril)" (p. 183; of ritual: "the sacrament [sic] . . . of virginity" (p. 315); of apotheosis: "No man is more wholly wrought in God's image or more inevitably his challenger than the poet" (p. 7). These are but a few obvious examples, and may be no more than the consistent exuberance of carelessness. Part of its effect is to engage the reader at every point. One would wish that it did so more through its admirable discoveries than its exasperating obfuscations.

RALPH E. MATLAW

Princeton University

CHAMBERLIN, WILLIAM HENRY.
The Evolution of a Conservative.
Chicago, Henry Regnery, 1959.
295 pp. \$4.50.

In the preface of this volume the author relates his purpose to record his search during the last twenty years for a "coherent and logical moral and political faith in an age . . . when many old and familiar political terms and labels have become obsolete and even misleading." By diligent application of known doctrines to realities of today he concluded that the "classical ideas of such thinkers as Edmund Burke, John Adams, and Alexis de Tocqueville constitute the best shield for individual liberty." With these standards of judgment in mind he then roams through history and literature gathering light from illustrative instances; he emerges with a philosophy which, if not a new gospel, is certainly a credo of conservatism, vividly colorful, ex-

citing, and mature, to which embattled individualists of the world might well repair.

Although the first chapter is entitled "The Birth of A Conservative," and the last one "A Personal Word," the "evolution" over his life span to date is not obvious in the sense of progression from the typically inadequate education of his youth through the years of world experience to his present status as an iconoclastic sage. In fact, the chapter headings are without time significance. They suggest the pungency of lecture titles. In the classroom manner each lecture has a summary paragraph just before the bell rings. We thus may indicate the flavor by selecting a few chapter titles and citing the keynote sentences: "Conservatism: Shield of Liberty": "It is under the conservative banner that all who believe that the state was made for the individual, not the individual for the state, may most hopefully rally."

"What's Wrong With America": "If the best single thing America offers to its citizens is wide opportunity and freedom of choice, the worst is erosion of character."

"No War, No Peace" (citing Trotsky's dictum on the Brest-Litovsk negotiations, early 1918): "The communists were united by iron discipline; their opponents were hopelessly divided. This is why the communists took over Russia. This . . . is how they may be able to take over the world."

"An American Conservative Manifesto": "The case for conservatism in economics and political science, in music and art, and in literature and education is too often allowed to go by default because many people are silent about their sincere convictions . . ."

There are twelve other chapters ranging in theme from the failure of socialism and the death of Anglo-American liberalism, to Marx, Freud, education, music, and baseball.

It may be that Chamberlin's call ("Conservatives, Unite!") will seem to some fatalists like King Canute's admonition to the waves. Many of the social consequences of industrialism were not adequately foreseen by the Founding Fathers — mass civilization manipulated via radio; intolerable pressures on Congress (in terms of elections) by labor racketeers; above all, the unmanageable giantism of the country's economy which threatens to make "consent of the governed" likewise unmanageable.

Contra, there are those who, along with Chamberlin, view with dismay the trends of the times to unmanageable bigness as phrased by Lenin: Big Government requires Big Bureaucracy, which requires Big Secret Police to be manageable. Otherwise bigness crumbles through internal malaise. For such as these, Chamberlin's book is a call for a modernized version of the revolution of 1782, adapted to the nuclear age but preserving the master dicta of humanity which changes not with advances in tools and weapons. Chamberlin would restore the balance between humanity and the power of the all-engulfing mass which downgrades the person and obliterates the soul.

As a conservationist, Chamberlin would have thinking Americans begin to replant the burnt-over areas of our political forest. As a skillful synthesizer of past thought on this subject he would agree with the aphorism of Justice Holmes (ascribed): "We need elaboration of

the obvious more than we need elucidation of the obscure." This may be old gospel; it has been "ne'r so well exprest" as in this volume.

To those of us who shared the transition from the NEP to the Iron Age in Moscow (1920's) this volume recalls unforgotten debates around the samovar with Walter Duranty, Chamberlin, and Louis Fischer as the oracles of the longest standing and the most eloquent opinions. In retrospect we are still astonished by Chamberlin's prodigious memory, and by his unceasing industry at that time, (aided by his wife, Sonia, who labored over the manuscripts of the early years of the revolution). He was not on the train, so to say; therefore he did not have to "flip off when going around the curve" as did certain other Americans of the 1920's. He refers to 1940 as a sort of turning point. One recalls that he vowed at

that time never again to be a refugee, recollecting the long muddled panic from Paris to Bordeaux. In presenting this harvest of the years, replete with new and sparkling Chamberlinism, one can say again he has been valiant in his faith that "the supreme social good [is] the free development of the individual . . . and a free, competitive economic system based on private property."

This reviewer had the privilege of writing an appreciative essay on Chamberlin's first book, *Soviet Russia*, 1929. The present volume, climaxed by the final chapter, "A Personal Word," is in the true sense an *apologia pro vita* of a keen political philosopher, endowed with both courage and style; it is at once a testament and the story of a pilgrimage.

BRUCE C. HOPPER
Harvard University

Index to Volume 18

(JANUARY-OCTOBER 1959)

(Reviews are entered under the author of the book and under reviewer)

	No.	Page
Akhmatova, Anna. Poems translated by Robin Kemball	4	307
Alexandrova, Vera: Soviet Literature in 1958	2	126
Baldwin, Hanson W.: <i>The Great Arms Race</i> . Rev. by William B. Ballis	1	61
Ballis, William B.: Hanson W. Baldwin's <i>The Great Arms Race</i>	1	61
—Raymond L. Garthoff's <i>Soviet Strategy in the Nuclear Age</i>	1	61
Barghoorn, Frederick C.: U.S.S.R. Revisited	2	96
—Merle Fainsod's <i>Smolensk Under Soviet Rule</i>	3	238
Bibliography: Books, Pamphlets, and Articles on Russia Published in 1958. Evelyn R. Hansen	3	257
Billington, James A.: <i>Mikhailovsky and Russian Populism</i> . Rev. by Donald W. Treadgold	1	63
Blok, Alexander. Poems translated by Robin Kemball	4	307
Book Notices	1	76
Book Notices	3	249
Brandt, Conrad: <i>Stalin's Failure in China, 1924-1927</i> . Rev. by John S. Curtiss	2	148
Brown, Edward J.: Nikolai Gorchakov's <i>The Theatre in Soviet Russia</i>	1	68
Brzezinski, Zbigniew: Derek Scott's <i>Russian Political Institutions</i>	2	146
Byrnes, Robert F.: Edward Rojek's <i>Allied Wartime Diplomacy: A Pattern in Poland</i>	1	67
Campbell, Robert W.: R. W. Davies' <i>The Development of the Soviet Budgetary System</i>	1	66
—Holland Hunter's <i>Soviet Transportation Policy</i>	2	153
Carr, Edward Hallett: <i>Socialism in One Country</i> . Rev. by William Henry Chamberlin	3	237
Chamberlin, William Henry: <i>The Tragedy of the Russian Intelligentsia</i>	2	89
— <i>The Evolution of a Conservative</i> . Rev. by Bruce C. Hopper	4	352
—Edward Hallett Carr's <i>Socialism in One Country</i>	3	237
—Baron Peter Wrangel's <i>Always with Honor</i>	2	151
Charques, Richard: <i>The Twilight of Imperial Russia</i> . Rev. by Dimitri von Mohrenschildt	3	244
Cheng, Tien-fong: <i>A History of Sino-Russian Relations</i> . Rev. by Charles B. McLane	1	72
Clarkson, Jesse D.: Anatole G. Mazour's <i>Modern Russian Historiography</i>	3	247

Curtiss, John S.: <i>Conrad Brandt's Stalin's Failure in China, 1924-1927</i>	2	148
Dallin, Alexander: <i>German Rule in Russia, 1941-1945</i> . Rev. by Richard D. Newell	2	145
Dallin, David J.: <i>The Main Traits of Soviet Empire-Building</i>	1	3
Davies, R. W.: <i>The Development of the Soviet Budgetary System</i> . Rev. by Robert W. Campbell	1	66
Epstein, Fritz T.: Z. A. B. Zeman's (ed.) <i>Germany and the Revolution in Russia, 1915-1918. Documents from the Archives of the German Foreign Ministry</i>	4	342
Ermolov — Proconsul of the Caucasus. Michael Whittock	1	53
Fainsod, Merle: <i>Smolensk Under Soviet Rule</i> . Rev. by Frederick C. Barghoorn	3	238
Fisher, Ralph T., Jr.: <i>Pattern for Soviet Youth: A Study of the Congresses of the Komsomol, 1918-1954</i> . Rev. by N. S. Timasheff	3	239
Franklin, Benjamin and Michael Lomonosov, <i>Two Self-Made Men of the Eighteenth Century</i> . W. Chapin Huntington	4	294
Fueloep-Miller, René: <i>Marija Gimbutas' Ancient Symbolism in Lithuanian Folklore</i>	1	73
—Princess Zinaida Schakovskoy's <i>The Privilege Was Mine</i>	2	162
Garthoff, Raymond L.: <i>Soviet Strategy in the Nuclear Age</i> . Rev. by William B. Ballis	1	61
Gibian, George: <i>Turgenev's Literary Reminiscences</i> . Trans. with an Intr. by David Magarshack and an Essay by Edmund Wilson	2	160
Gimbutas, Marija: <i>Ancient Symbolism in Lithuanian Folklore</i> . Rev. by René Fueloep-Miller	1	73
Gorchakov, Nikolai: <i>The Theatre in Soviet Russia</i> . Rev. by Edward J. Brown	1	68
Guins, George C.: <i>Andrew Malozemoff's Russian Far-Eastern Policy, 1881-1904</i>	4	346
Helphand-Parvus, Alexander, — <i>Russian Revolutionary and German Patriot</i> . Heinz Schurer	4	313
Hodgson, John H.: C. Jay Smith, Jr.'s <i>Finland and the Russian Revolution, 1917-1922</i>	2	149
Hopper, Bruce C.: <i>William Henry Chamberlin's The Evolution of a Conservative</i>	4	352
Hunter, Holland: <i>Soviet Transportation Policy</i> . Rev. by Robert W. Campbell	2	153
Huntington, W. Chapin. <i>Two Self-Made Men of the Eighteenth Century: Michael Lomonosov and Benjamin Franklin</i>	4	294
Iswolsky, Helene: <i>Muranovo — "The House of Poets"</i>	3	231
Jackson, Lt. Col. W. G. F.: <i>Seven Roads to Moscow</i> . Rev. by Marc Raeff	4	348
Jelavich, Charles: <i>Tsarist Russia and Balkan Nationalism</i> . Rev. by Otakar Odlozilik	3	243
Kalb, Marvin: <i>Eastern Exposure</i> . Rev. by S. I. Ploss	2	164

Karpov, L. I. (with V. A. Severtsev, eds.): <i>Vysshaya Shkola, osnovnye postanovleniya</i> , (The Higher School, Basic Regulations). Rev. by William K. Medlin	1	75
Kazemzadeh, F.: Warren Walsh's <i>Russia and the Soviet Union</i>	4	344
Kemball, Robin: Poems from Blok and Akhmatova (translations)	4	307
Kennan, George F.: <i>Sister Anne Meiburger's Efforts of Raymond Robins Toward the Recognition of Soviet Russia and the Outlawry of War</i>	2	150
Khrushchev: A Political Profile (Part II). William K. Medlin	1	23
—(Part III)	2	131
—(Part IV)	3	173
Konovalov, S. (ed.) <i>Oxford Slavonic Papers</i> , Vol. VIII. Rev. by R. A. Maguire	2	161
Kulski, W. W.: Soviet Colonialism and Anti-Colonialism	2	113
Leonov, Leonid. Helen Muchnic	1	35
Lomonosov, Michael and Benjamin Franklin, Two Self-Made Men of the Eighteenth Century. W. Chapin Huntington	4	294
Low, Alfred D.: Alfred G. Meyer's <i>Leninism</i>	3	241
Luckyj, George (ed.) <i>Canadian Slavonic Papers</i> , Vol. II. Rev. by R. A. Maguire	2	161
Maguire, R. A.: George Luckyj (ed.) <i>Canadian Slavonic Papers</i> , Vol. II; S. Konovalov, (ed.) <i>Oxford Slavonic Papers</i> , Vol. VIII	2	161
Malozemoff, Andrew: <i>Russian Far-Eastern Policy, 1881-1904</i> . Rev. by George C. Guins	4	346
Marcuse, Herbert: <i>Soviet Marxism</i> . Rev. by Adam B. Ulam	1	65
Markov, Vladimir: Notes on Pasternak's "Dr. Zhivago"	1	14
Matlaw, Ralph E.: Ernest J. Simmons' <i>Russian Fiction and Soviet Ideology</i>	2	154
—George Steiner's <i>Dostoevsky or Tolstoy. An Essay in the Old Criticism</i>	4	351
Mazour, Anatole G.: <i>Modern Russian Historiography</i> . Rev. by Jesse D. Clarkson	3	247
McLane, Charles B.: <i>Soviet Policy and the Chinese Communists, 1931-1946</i> . Rev. by Richard L. Walker	4	349
—Tien-fong Cheng's <i>A History of Sino-Russian Relations</i>	1	72
Medlin, William K.: Khrushchev: A Political Profile. (Part II)	1	23
—(Part III)	2	131
—(Part IV)	3	173
—L. I. Karpov's and V. A. Severtsev's (eds.) <i>Vysshaya shkola, osnovnye postanovleniya</i> , (The Higher School, Basic Regulations)	1	75
Meiburger, Sister Anne: <i>Efforts of Raymond Robins Toward the Recognition of Soviet Russia and the Outlawry of War</i> . Rev. by George F. Kennan	2	150
Meyer, Alfred G.: <i>Leninism</i> . Rev. by Alfred D. Low	3	24
Moorhead, Alan: <i>The Russian Revolution</i> . Rev. by Dimitri von Mohrenschildt	3	244

Muchnic, Helen: Leonid Leonov	1	35
Muranovo — "The House of Poets" Helene Iswolsky	3	231
Newell, Richard D.: Alexander Dallin's <i>German Rule in Russia, 1941-1945</i>	2	145
Odlozilik, Otakar: Charles Jelavich's <i>Tsarist Russia and Balkan Nationalism</i>	3	243
Pasternak's Dr. Zhivago, The Myth Behind. R. E. Steussy	3	184
—"Dr. Zhivago," Notes on. Vladimir Markov	1	14
Petrov, Victor P. Some Observations on the 1959 Soviet Census	4	332
Pipes, Richard: Oliver H. Radkey's <i>The Agrarian Foes of Bolshevism</i>	4	339
Ploss, S. I.: Marvin Kalb's <i>Eastern Exposure</i>	2	164
Radkey, Oliver H.: <i>The Agrarian Foes of Bolshevism</i> . Rev. by Richard Pipes	4	339
Raeff, Marc: Lt. Col. W. G. F. Jackson's <i>Seven Roads to Moscow</i>	4	348
—Some Reflections on Russian Liberalism	3	218
Riasanovsky, Nicholas V.: Mikhail Zetlin's <i>The Decembrists</i>	1	71
—Letter to the Editor	3	252
Rojek, Edward: <i>Allied Wartime Diplomacy: A Pattern in Poland</i> . Rev. by Robert F. Byrnes	1	67
Russia's Moslems, American Research on. Serge A. Zenkovsky	3	199
Russian Intelligentsia, The Tragedy of the. William Henry Chamberlin	2	89
Russian Liberalism, Some Reflections on. Marc Raeff	3	218
Saunders, Comdr. M. G., RN (ed.): <i>The Soviet Navy</i> . Rev. by A. E. Sokol	4	346
Schakovskoy, Princess Zinaida: <i>The Privilege Was Mine</i> . Rev. by René Fuelleop-Miller	2	162
Schurer, Heinz. Alexander Helphand-Parvus—Russian Revolutionary and German Patriot	4	313
Scott, Derek: <i>Russian Political Institutions</i> . Rev. by Zbigniew Brzezinski	2	146
Severtsev, V. A. (with L. I. Karpov, eds.): <i>Vyssshaya, shkola, osnovnye postanovleniya</i> , (The Higher School, Basic Regulations). Rev. by William K. Medlin	1	75
Shub, David: Letter to the Editor	2	166
Simmons, Ernest J.: <i>Russian Fiction and Soviet Ideology</i> . Rev. by Ralph E. Matlaw	2	154
Smith, C. Jay, Jr.: <i>Finland and the Russian Revolution, 1917-1922</i> . Rev. by John H. Hodgson	2	149
Sokol, A. E.: Comdr. M. G. Saunders' (ed.) <i>The Soviet Navy</i>	4	346
Stammler, Heinrich: Wladimir Weidle's <i>Zadacha Rossii</i>	3	245
Steiner, George: <i>Dostoevsky or Tolstoy. An Essay in the Old Criticism</i> . Rev. by Ralph E. Matlaw	4	351
Steussy, R. E.: The Myth Behind "Dr. Zhivago"	3	184
Struve, Gleb: Vyacheslav Zavalishin's <i>Early Soviet Writers</i>	2	156
Soviet Census 1959, Some Observations on the. Victor P. Petrov	4	332

Soviet Colonialism and Anti-Colonialism. W. W. Kulski	2	113
Soviet Empire-Building. The Main Traits of. David J. Dallin	1	3
Soviet Literature in 1958. Vera Alexandrova	2	126
Soviet Union, Party and Church in the. Travel Notes. Robert C. Tucker	4	285
Tarsaidze, Alexandre: <i>Czars and Presidents. The Story of a Forgotten Friendship</i> . Rev. by Warren B. Walsh.	1	70
Timasheff, N. S.: Ralph T. Fisher, Jr.'s <i>Pattern for Soviet Youth: A Study of the Congresses of the Komsomol, 1918-1954</i>	3	239
Treadgold, Donald W.: James A. Billington's <i>Mikhailovsky and Russian Populism</i>	1	63
Tucker, Robert C.: Party and Church in the Soviet Union, Travel Notes	4	285
<i>Turgenev's Literary Reminiscences</i> . Trans. with an Intr. by David Magarshack and an Essay by Edmund Wilson. Rev. by George Gibian	2	160
Ulam, Adam B.: Herbert Marcuse's <i>Soviet Marxism</i>	1	65
U. S. S. R. Revisited. Frederick C. Barghoorn	2	96
Vernadsky, George: <i>The Origins of Russia</i> . Rev. by Serge A. Zenkovsky	4	340
von Mohrenschildt, Dimitri: Richard Charques' <i>The Twilight of Imperial Russia</i>	3	244
—Alan Moorhead's <i>The Russian Revolution</i>	3	244
Walker, Richard L.: Charles B. McLane's <i>Soviet Policy and the Chinese Communists, 1931-1946</i>	4	349
Walsh, Warren B.: Alexandre Tarsaidze's <i>Czars and Presidents. The Story of a Forgotten Friendship</i>	1	70
—Russia and the Soviet Union. Rev. by F. Kazemzadeh	4	344
—Melvin C. Wren's <i>The Course of Russian History</i>	2	154
Weidle, Wladimir: <i>Zadacha Rossii</i> . Rev. by Heinrich Stammeler	3	245
Whittock, Michael: Ermolov — Proconsul of the Caucasus	1	53
Wrangel, Baron Peter: <i>Always with Honor</i> . Rev. by William Henry Chamberlin	2	151
Wren, Melvin C.: <i>The Course of Russian History</i> . Rev. by Warren B. Walsh	2	154
Zavalishin, Vyacheslav: <i>Early Soviet Writers</i> . Rev. by Gleb Struve	2	156
—Letter to the Editor	3	253
Zeman, Z. A. B. (ed.): <i>Germany and the Revolution in Russia, 1915-1918. Documents from the Archives of the German Foreign Ministry</i> . Rev. by Fritz. T. Epstein	4	342
Zenkovsky, Serge A.: American Research on Russia's Moslems	3	199
—George Vernadsky's <i>The Origins of Russia</i>	4	340
Zetlin, Mikhail: <i>The Decembrists</i> . Rev. by Nicholas V. Riasanovsky	1	71

ERRATA

The following *errata* occurred in Marc Raeff's article, "Some Reflections on Russian Liberalism" in the July, 1959 issue of *The Russian Review*:

p. 219, Note 4 should be: "has led to the *blurring* of the 'left' boundaries" instead of "*burning*."

p. 223, line 4 from top: should read "kingship" instead of "kinship."

p. 223, Note 12 should read *D. Gerhard* instead of *G. Dietrich*.

p. 230, Note 31 should be Pasternak.

THE SOVIET CITIZEN

Daily Life in a Totalitarian Society

By **ALEX INKELES and RAYMOND A. BAUER.** Russian industrial society as it appears to the Russians themselves. Using thousands of carefully evaluated interviews, dealing with such matters as home, school, work, play, and political activity, this book reports on Soviet society and what it means to its citizens. A surprising correlation appears between the experience of Soviet citizens and that of their counterparts in other industrial societies. \$10.00

THE FORMATION OF THE BALTIC STATES

A Study of the Effects of Great Power Politics Upon the

Emergence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia

By **STANLEY W. PAGE.** An illuminating and objective book that shows how the Baltic peoples won their independence after World War I through a complex, almost freakish juxtaposition of forces that temporarily neutralized the influence of the great European nations. \$4.50

KARAMZIN'S MEMOIR ON ANCIENT AND MODERN RUSSIA

A Translation and Analysis

By **RICHARD PIPES.** Most studies of Russian intellectual history have emphasized primarily liberal and radical tendencies. By exploring the intellectual and social environment in which Karamzin lived, and tracing his political development, the author placed the conservative tradition into proper perspective. \$5.50

Also available in the Russian Text: **N. M. Karamzin, A MEMOIR ON ANCIENT AND MODERN RUSSIA.** Edited by Richard Pipes. Contains the complete text in Russian of the rare but important document written in 1810-11 for the personal use of Tzar Alexander I. \$5.00



Through your bookseller, or from

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

79 Garden Street, Cambridge 38, Massachusetts

UNIVERSITY OF



THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE

A Reader on their History and Culture

by V. Tschebotarioff Bill

FOR advanced students of Russian — particularly as a text for second or third year students. Selected from the writings of Russia's leading historians, artistically edited for graded vocabulary levels—the anthology includes chapters on crucial historical events and movements, geography, literature, painting, music, ideologies, the Revolution of 1917, and the contemporary Soviet scene.

The author's emphasis upon the best, most vibrant prose of the leading Russian historians makes the book engrossing in its own right—and is designed to help the student develop a taste and "feel" for the art of the Russian language, as well as prepare him for unaided scholarly work. Author of *THE FORGOTTEN CLASS* and of many articles for *The Russian Review*, Professor Bill received her doctorate from the University of Berlin; she has conducted research at the Institute for Advanced Study, and since 1946 has been lecturer in Russian at Princeton University.

\$4.00

Through your bookseller

UNIVERSITY OF



5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago 37, Illinois

IN CANADA: The University of Toronto Press, Toronto 5, Ontario

The Kilgour Collection of Russian Literature, 1750-1920

*With Notes on Early Books and Manuscripts of the
16th and 17th Centuries*

Preface by WILLIAM A. JACKSON. *Antiquarian Bookman* says, "To our knowledge, this is the only work of its kind, in any language—including the Russian . . . Here, in one handsome volume—at a very low price—are reproductions of the original title pages of some 1300 first editions in Russian belles lettres, together with English transliterations of author and title, as well as most important annotations. Also included are early books and mss. bookplates, labels, library stamps, etc. . . . Russian literature is illuminated for the first time in its bibliographic splendor in this authoritative work, an essential reference in world literature, especially at this time . . ." Quarto, 1400 illus. \$17.50



Distributed for the
HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY *by*
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
79 Garden Street, Cambridge 38, Mass.

THE RUSSIAN PUSH TOWARD JAPAN

Russo-Japanese Relations, 1697-1875

By GEORGE ALEXANDER LENSEN

What were some of the first impressions made by the Japanese and the Russians on each other? What was the nature of the early Russian pressure on Japan? By whom was Russian policy determined? These and many other crucial questions are dealt with in this diplomatic history of a little known period — the first of a projected two-volume study on Russo-Japanese relations from the beginnings to the present. Mr. Lensen has worked for a decade with rare Japanese and Russian source materials to present this authoritative account that amply demonstrates how the heritage of early relations between these two nations has an important bearing on today's struggle for mastery of the Far East. 616 pages. Maps and Illustrations. \$10



Order from your bookstore, or

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS, Princeton, New Jersey

WORLD POLITICS

A Quarterly Journal of International Relations

Under the Editorial Sponsorship of the

CENTER OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Contents, Vol. XII, No. 1, October 1959

Russia, The West & World Order	by ROBERT C. TUCKER
Between Stresemann & Hitler: The Foreign Policy of the Brüning Government	by WOLFGANG J. HELBICH
Khrushchev's Revolution in Industrial Management	by HOWARD R. SWEARE
Sino-Soviet Aid to South and Southeast Asia	by HENRY G. AUBREY

Research Note

Some Observations on Political Gaming	by HERBERT GOLDHAMER & HANS SPEIER
---	------------------------------------

Review Articles

National Intelligence & Policy	by ALLAN EVANS
A Hypothesis About the Nature of an Archaic Society	by ROBERT WAELDER
India's Political Future	by MYRON WEINER
Pragmatic Approaches to Political Communication	by W. PHILLIPS DAVISON
Disarmament or the Balance of Terror?	by ARTHUR LEE BURNS
China, Communism and the United States	by MICHAEL LINDSAY

Subscriptions \$6.00 a year, (two years, \$10.00) single copies, \$2.00

Address: WORLD POLITICS

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS, Box 231, Princeton, N. J.

Statement Required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as Amended by the Acts of March 3, 1933, and July 2, 1946 (Title 39, United States Code, Section 233) Showing the Ownership, Management, and Circulation

OF THE RUSSIAN REVIEW published quarterly at Hanover, N. H., additional entry Deep River, Conn., for October 1, 1959.

1. The names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Publisher, The Russian Review, Inc., 235 Baker Library, Hanover, N. H.; Editor, Dimitri von Mohrenschildt, 235 Baker Library, Hanover, N. H.; Managing editor, none; Business manager, none.

2. The owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual member, must be given.)

The Russian Review, Inc., 235 Baker Library, Hanover, N. H. Voluntary, non-stock corporation.

3. The known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (if there are none, so state.) None.

4. Paragraphs 2 and 3 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting; also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner.

DIMITRI VON MOHRENSCHILDT
Editor

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 20th day of August, 1959.

GORDON H. GLIDDON, Notary Public.
(My commission expires Oct. 15, 1962)

Atomic Energy in the Soviet Union

ARNOLD KRAMISH

The history, present scope, and future possibilities of Soviet nuclear research and development are presented in a compact, comprehensive report for the first time. Assembled from thousands of Soviet newspapers and technical journals, many facts will be revealing even to the specialist. \$4.75

A Calendar of Soviet Treaties

ROBERT M. SLUSSER and JAN F. TRISKA

The fullest and most accurate guide available in any language to the more than two thousand international agreements entered into by Soviet Russia in the years from 1917 through 1957. A pioneering work in the fields of international relations and Soviet foreign policy, assembled from official sources. Hoover Institution Documentary Series, No. 4. \$15.00

Biennial Review of Anthropology 1959

BERNARD J. SIEGEL, *Editor*

First volume of a series devoted to periodic reviews of published anthropological research. Recent trends in Soviet anthropology are appraised in this volume, in addition to summarizing work in the United States since 1955. Summaries by leading scholars of papers and monographs in the field. \$6.00

Order from your bookstore, please

STANFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

